Before the COPYRIGHT OFFICE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS Washington, D.C.

In the matter of:

Distribution of the 1998 and 1999 Cable Royalty Funds | Docket No. | 2001-8 CARP CD 98-99

Room LM-414 Library of Congress First and Independence Ave. S.E. Washington, D.C. 20540

Wednesday, May 14, 2003

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE CURTIS E. Von KANN Chairman
THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN Arbitrator
THE HONORABLE MICHAEL D. YOUNG Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Program Suppliers:

GREGORY OLANIRAN, ESQ
ROBERT L. ESKAY, ESQ
SARAH K. JOHNSON, ESQ
MICHAEL E. TUCCI, ESQ
Stinson Morrison Hecker, LLP
1150 18th Street, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036-3816
(202) 785-9100

On Behalf of the Joint Sports Claimants:

Counsel for the Office of the Commissioner of Baseball
ROBERT ALAN GARRETT, ESQ
JAMES COOPER, ESQ
MICHELE T. DUNLOP, ESQ
RONALD A. SCHECHTER, ESQ
JULE SIGALL, ESQ
CHRISTOPHER WINTERS, ESQ
MICHELE WOODS, ESQ
Arnold & Porter
555 Twelfth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-1206

THOMAS J. OSTERTAG Senior Vice President & General Counsel Office of the Commissioner of Baseball 245 Park Avenue New York, New York 10167

Counsel for the National Basketball Association,
National Football League, and National Hockey
League
PHILIP R. HOCHBERG, ESQ
PIPER RUDNICK, ESQ
Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson & Hand
901 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

On Behalf of the Joint Sports Claimants: (cont.)

Counsel for the National Collegiate Athletic Association
RITCHIE THOMAS, ESQ
JUDITH JURIN SEMO, ESQ
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, LLP
1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004

On Behalf of the Public Television Claimants:

TIMOTHY C. HESTER, ESQ RONALD G. DOVE, ESQ RUSSELL JESSE, ESQ Covington & Burling 1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C., 20044-7566

PAUL GRECO, ESQ Public Broadcasting Service 1320 Braddock Place Alexandria, Virginia 22314

On Behalf of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers:

I. FRED KOENIGSBERG, ESQ CAROL A. WITSCHEL, ESQ White & Case 1155 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036-2787

JAMES M. McGIVERN, ESQ SAMUEL MOSENKIS, ESQ ASCAP One Lincoln Plaza New York, New York 10023

On Behalf of BMI:

MICHAEL J. REMINGTON, ESQ
ADAM L. BREA, ESQ
JEFFREY J. LOPEZ, ESQ
PHILIP J. MAUSE, ESQ
Drinker, Biddle & Reath, LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

MARVIN J. BERENSON, ESQ JOSEPH J. DIMONA, ESQ MARC D. OSTROW, ESQ Broadcast Music, Inc. 320 West 57th Street, New York, New York 10019

On Behalf of SESAC, Inc:

JOHN C. BEITER, ESQ Loeb & Loeb 45 Music Square West Nashville, Tennessee 37203

PATRICK COLLINS, ESQ SESAC, Inc. 55 Music Square East Nashville, Tennessee 37023

On Behalf of National Public Radio:

NIKI KUCKES, ESQ Baker Botts LLP The Warner 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-2400

NEAL A. JACKSON, ESQ GREGORY LEWIS National Public Radio 635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

On Behalf of the Canadian Claimants Group:

L. KENDALL SATTERFIELD, ESQ RICHARD M. VOLIN, ESQ Finkelstein, Thompson & Loughran 1050 30th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20007 (202) 337-8000

On Behalf of the National Association of Broadcasters:

JOHN I. STEWART, ESQ
PARUL DESAI, ESQ
KAREN C. HERMAN, ESQ
VALERIE HINKO, ESQ
MICHAEL LAZARUS, ESQ
Crowell & Moring
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 624-2926

HENRY L. BAUMANN, ESQ BART STRINGHAM, ESQ National Association of Broadcasters 1771 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Counsel For Devotional Claimants On Behalf of the Devotional Claimants:

FRANK KOSZORUS, ESQ Collier Shannon Rill & Scott 3050 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

JAMES CANNING, ESQ Our Own Performance Society 400 2nd Avenue, Ste., 22C New York, New York 20007

RAUL GALAZ, ESQ Independent Producers Group 2318 Sawgrass Ridge San Antonio, Texas 78258

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

On Behalf of Christian Broadcasting Network, Inc.; and the Devotional Claimants:

BARRY H. GOTTFRIED, ESQ CLIFFORD M. HARRINGTON, ESQ ShawPittman 2300 N Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

On Behalf of Coral Ridge Ministries Media, Inc.; Oral Roberts Evangelistic Association:

GEORGE R. GRANGE, II, ESQ KENNETH E. LIU, ESQ Gammon & Grange, P.C. 8280 Greensboro Drive Seventh Floor McLean, Virginia 22102

On Behalf of KNLJ (New Life Evangelistic Center, Inc.):

JOHN H. MIDLEN, JR, ESQ Midlen Law Center 7618 Lynn Chevy Chase, Maryland 20815

On Behalf of the Home Shopping Network, Inc.; Independent Producers Group; Home Shopping en Espanol and AST LLC; and Crystal Cathedral Ministries, Inc.:

ARNOLD P. LUTZKER, ESQ CARL H. SETTLEMEYER, ESQ Lutzker & Lutzker 1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

I-N-D-E-X

WITNESS	DIRECT	CROSS	REDIRECT	RECROSS
John Fuller				
By Mr. Hester	3295		3597	
By Mr. Stewart		3354		3590
By Mr. Tucci		3398		3632
By Mr. Garrett				3630

E-X-H-I-B-I-T-S

Exhibit No.	Description	Mark Recd
Demo 9	Survey Excerpts	3368
Demo 10	Sieber Testimony	3593
Dellio 10	Dieber resermony	3373
<u>PS</u>		
Demo 6	Sieber Testimony	3399
26-X	Media in the Home	3415 3422
27-X	Hollywood Reporter Article	3428 3435
28-X	WSJ Article	3435 3439
Demo 8	Chart	3441
29-X	PBS Kids Website	3446 3448
30-X	Arthur Website	3449 3450
31-X	Barney Website	3450 3451
32-X	Dragon Tales Website	3451 3453
33-X	PBS v Cable	3460 3464
34-X	PBS Research	3481 3510
Demo 9	Cable Network Ratings	3496
<u>JSC</u>		
Demo 16	Fuller Testimony	3522
24-X	CDC PBS Data	3528 3538
25-X	CDC PBS Data	3539 3551
Demo 17		3540
26-X	PBS Data	3570 3574
27-X	WWPB Programs	3574 3585
28-X	WETA Programs	3574 3585
Demo 18		3587
ספיני		
<u>PTV</u> 27	Conque Data	3616
<i>L</i> 1	Census Data	2010

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(9:33 a.m.)
3	JUDGE von KANN: Good morning, everyone.
4	Any preliminary matters before we get going?
5	(No response.)
6	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. Apparently not.
7	Mr. Hester?
8	MR. HESTER: Public Television Claimants
9	call as our next witness Mr. John Fuller.
10	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. Mr. Fuller, good
11	morning.
12	THE WITNESS: Good morning.
13	THE REPORTER: Mr. Fuller, would you raise
14	your right arm, please?
15	Whereupon,
16	JOHN W. FULLER
17	was called as a witness by counsel for the Public
18	Television Claimants and, having been first duly
19	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
20	THE REPORTER: Thank you.
21	DIRECT EXAMINATION
22	BY MR. HESTER:

1	Q Could you state your name and title for
2	the record, please?
3	A My name is John W. Fuller. And I'm the
4	senior director of research at PBS.
5	Q Mr. Fuller, could you describe your
6	responsibilities at PBS?
7	A My responsibilities include the management
8	of the PBS research department. And specifically we
9	are in charge and responsible for the analysis data
10	collection of audience data and also marketing
11	research projects at PBS.
12	Q How long have you been with PBS?
13	A Since 1980, 22 years.
14	Q And how long in your current position?
15	A Since '99.
16	Q What positions did you hold previously at
L7	PBS?
L8	A From '85 to '99, I was the director of
L9	research. And from '80 to '85, I was associate
20	director of research.
21	Q So you've been in research positions
22	during your entire time at PBS?

1	A The whole time.
2	Q Before you joined PBS, what job positions
3	did you hold?
4	A Okay. Going backwards from '76 to '80, I
5	was a project manager at the Arbitron Ratings Company.
6	Prior to that, I spent four years as program and
7	research director of WTLV, Jacksonville, Florida, an
8	NBC affiliate. Prior to that, I was in graduate
9	school at the University of Florida.
10	Prior to that, '66 through '70, I was a
11	had several positions, director and studio director
L2	and promotion manager variously at WJKS TV in
13	Jacksonville, Florida, an ABC affiliate; before that,
1.4	a radio station; and before that, Florida State
L5	undergraduate.
L6	Q Mr. Fuller, are you sponsoring testimony
L7	and accompanying exhibits in this proceeding?
18	A Yes.
19	MR. HESTER: I would make the witness
20	available for voir dire.
21	JUDGE von KANN: Any voir dire?
22	MR. STEWART: None.

1	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
2	BY MR. HESTER:
3	Q Mr. Fuller, I wanted to ask you first to
4	turn to page 3 of your testimony.
5	A All right.
6	Q At the bottom of the page, you have a
7	sentence that discusses the fact that 23 percent of
8	cable systems retransmitted a distant Public
9	Television signal in 1998 and 1999. Do you see that?
10	A Yes, I do.
11	Q Could you just explain that statement a
12	little bit more and explain the basis for that
13	conclusion?
14	A Well, it's very straightforward. Of all
15	of the cable systems in the country during that period
16	of time, almost a fourth of them were carrying at
17	least one Public Television signal on a distant basis.
18	And also of those, half of them were also carrying a
19	local signal, in addition to the distant signal, which
20	is interesting evidence of the additional value that
21	the distant signal brought in I think.
22	Q I wanted to ask you, please, to turn to

exhibit 15, PTV exhibit 15, which is indicated as the source for your statement there. Could you simply help us walk through the tables in this exhibit, the columns in this exhibit 15, so we can understand what the data reflect here?

A Sure. First of all, all of the data in here have to do with systems that carry at least one distant Public Television signal. So that's the universe of numbers we're looking at. And probably the best place to start is the center column, which gives that total number.

There's about 500 over the years. It has actually increased a bit, systems that carry at least one public station on a distant basis. The column to the left of it, which, actually, I guess, is the second column, shows the number of those systems that not only carry a distant signal, but also a local Public Television signal at the same time.

So then if you skip over to the last column on the right, then you can see the proportion that that represents, which is to say about one-half, which was my statement earlier, carried both a local

1	and a distant signal.
2	Q And the reference to systems here, could
3	you describe what kinds of systems you're referring
4	to, these Form 3 systems?
5	A Oh, well, all of these are Form 3. I
6	mean, they are the larger systems excluding, of
7	course, Form 1 and Form 2.
8	Q And so does this reflect at least some
9	amount of increase in the number of systems that
10	carried at least one Public Television signal from
11	1992 through 1999?
12	A Right. That's what I mentioned earlier.
13	You can see it in both columns. The number to carry
14	at least one has gone up from over the whole period
15	from 479 to 524. It's about a ten percent growth, I
16	think. And then the number that carried both a
17	distant and a local has gone from 228 to 265, a little
18	wobbled in there but generally an increase over the
19	period.
20	Q Now, I wanted to ask you next to help us
21	walk through table 16.
22	MR. HESTER: I should remind the panel you

1	may recall there was a motion we had filed to correct
2	exhibit 16 and some of the references to it in Mr.
3	Fuller's testimony that was granted by the panel. So
4	I hope you have the corrected exhibit 16 somewhere.
5	JUDGE von KANN: I have your corrected
6	pages. So the answer is yes.
7	MR. HESTER: Okay. Good.
8	JUDGE von KANN: Let me ask Mr. Fuller one
9	question about 15 before we leave it, make sure I am
10	following it. Focusing on, let's say, the last
11	number, 99-2, we have got 534 Form 3 cable systems,
12	which are carrying at least one PBS station as a
13	distant signal.
14	THE WITNESS: That is right.
15	JUDGE von KANN: And of that,
16	approximately half also carry a local PBS station, in
17	addition?
18	THE WITNESS: Right, exactly right.
19	JUDGE von KANN: Now, that 534 is about a
20	fourth of the roughly 2,000 or so Form 3 cable systems
21	in the country, as I understand it.
22	THE WITNESS: Exactly.

1	JUDGE von KANN: I gather there may be an
2	additional group of Form 3 cable systems beyond this
3	534, maybe I don't know. Is this possible? that
4	are carrying PBS as a local signal and on any distant
5	PBS, but they have a PBS station on their cable
6	system, which happens to be the local one.
7	THE WITNESS: That's right. I think most
8	systems carry at least a local PBS station, you know,
9	like 98 percent.
LO	JUDGE von KANN: That was my question. Do
L1	you have any sense? And you think it's about 98
L2	percent of all Form 3?
L3	THE WITNESS: That's my recollection, yes.
L4	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. I realize if
L5	nobody has got a distant one, then it's not
L6	compensable in this proceeding, but it gives us some
L7	sense of the cable operator's interest in PBS at
L8	least.
L9	So the fourth sounded a little bit skimpy,
20	and I wanted to see whether, in fact, a much broader
21	carriage occurred. And the answer is yes, but a big
22	chunk of them are just carrying the local station.

1	THE WITNESS: That may be related not so
2	much to whether or not they want the carriage as to
3	the fact that we have so many transmitters. We have
4	like 342 transmitters in 50 states.
5	JUDGE von KANN: Right.
6	THE WITNESS: Whereas, ABC or CBS would
7	have maybe 205 roughly. So there are a lot more
8	stations spread around to be close to a cable system
9	as local.
10	JUDGE YOUNG: Are PBS subject to
11	must-carry? Would you be the beneficiary of
12	must-carry?
13	THE WITNESS: I am not positive. I think
14	so, but I am not positive.
15	JUDGE GULIN: Ninety-eight percent you
16	believe have a local or 98 percent have either a local
17	or distant?
18	THE WITNESS: That would be either. They
19	have some public stations.
20	JUDGE GULIN: What I am trying to get a
21	handle on is the don't have a local. What percent of
22	them bring in a distant if you happen to

1	THE WITNESS: Of those who don't have
2	JUDGE GULIN: Don't have a local. I was
3	trying to figure that out from your testimony.
4	THE WITNESS: That's actually I think on
5	the next exhibit.
6	BY MR. HESTER:
7	Q Let me ask you, Mr. Fuller, first. Let's
8	stick with this question from the panel about the 98
9	percent. If you look over at the top of 4 in your
LO	testimony
L1	A Page 4?
L2	Q Page 4.
L3	A Oh, there it is. It says over 98 percent
L4	of all Form 3 cable systems carried at least one
L5	Public Television signal.
.6	JUDGE GULIN: Either local or distant?
.7	THE WITNESS: Local or distant.
.8	BY MR. HESTER:
_9	Q So how would that relate to the question
20	raised as to whether if the cable system does not have
21	a local signal, it would carry a distant signal?
22	A Well, it is the difference, I believe.

1	I'm doing this off the top of my head. If 98 percent
2	carried that can't be right. We have evidence in
3	exhibit 16 that shows that about what is it, about
4	2.1 million are carrying at least one distant signal
5	but no local signal. So that translates into what, a
6	little under four percent, I believe, of all cable
7	households.
8	Q You're not putting it in terms of
9	households.
10	A Yes.
11	Q I wanted to focus first in terms of
12	systems.
13	A Oh, I beg your pardon.
14	Q If 98 percent of Form 3 systems carry a
15	Public Television signal, what does that tell you
16	about the likelihood that they imported a distant
17	signal if they didn't have a local?
18	A Well, we know 23
19	JUDGE GULIN: I know it's very light. I
20	was just trying to get an idea of percentages.
21	MR. HESTER: Right.
22	THE WITNESS: Right.

1	JUDGE von KANN: I have a feeling while
2	we're doing this somehow coming back to me is sort of
3	the question if Martha has seven marbles and Susan has
4	four marbles but they each together have somehow I
5	think the way to
6	THE WITNESS: I feel the same way, sir.
7	MR. HESTER: We will work on that one,
8	Judge. We will work on that one.
9	BY MR. HESTER:
10	Q Let's see if we can turn to exhibit 16.
11	I wanted to make sure. Does the panel all
12	have the corrected exhibit 16?
13	JUDGE von KANN: What was the number of
14	transmitters you had local, 300 and
15	THE WITNESS: Three forty-two the last
16	time I looked. It might be off by one or two.
17	JUDGE von KANN: ABC had how many, 200?
18	THE WITNESS: Approximately 205, 207, 210,
19	somewhere in that zone.
20	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
21	BY MR. HESTER:
22	Q Mr. Fuller, if you could turn to exhibit

1	16? And you have the corrected version there as well?
2	A I do.
3	Q I wanted to ask you first to give us an
4	overview of what these columns signify.
5	A All right. I corrected myself a moment
6	ago. These are all subscribers, not cable systems.
7	And this is a count. Well, first of all, start with
8	the right-hand column. That is total cable
9	subscribers in the United States, plain and simple.
10	Then the columns
11	JUDGE YOUNG: All of these are households?
12	THE WITNESS: No. All of these are
13	yes, I beg your pardon. They're households or
14	subscribers, same thing. The first column with data
15	in it is the number of households that receive at
16	least one distant Public Television signal and no
17	local, just distant Public Television.
18	The middle column is the number that
19	received at least one distant Public Television signal
20	and one local. The third column of data is at least
21	one distant public station and two or more local
22	stations.

1	BY MR. HESTER:
2	Q So if we look at the first column of data
3	on the left, subscribers whose first Public Television
4	signal is distant, this signifies subscribers who do
5	not have access to a local Public Television signal
6	and receive
7	A That is correct. The only way they can
8	get a Public Television station is on a distant basis.
9	Their system has brought it in that way.
10	Q And then the middle column, which refers
11	to one local, describe again what that one means.
12	A Okay. That's again, the tolls receive
13	at least one distant public station, but they also get
14	a local station as well. This was that point I was
15	discussing a moment ago.
16	Q So those would be examples of where a
17	cable operator has elected to bring in a distant
18	signal, even though it has a local Public Television
19	signal on its system already?
20	A That's right. I mean, that could have
21	stuck with the local, but they elected to bring in a
22	distant signal as well for obvious positive reasons.

1	Q What are some of those positive reasons?
2	A Well, there are two key reasons, I think,
3	as I think John Wilson discussed some yesterday at
4	least it came up in the hearing that public
5	stations, just the way public stations operate, they
6	have great freedom to schedule however they wish.
7	They can play programs pretty much whenever they want
8	to. So there is a lot of scheduling diversity.
9	The other is a content diversity. John
10	had said and I think this is right that about 60
11	percent of what stations carry is PBS programs, but
12	the rest of it, they have freedom to put in whatever
13	they wish or they choose to put in whatever they wish.
14	So they acquire programming or they
15	produce programming or whatever, and they come up with
16	this big kind of a semi-unique menu of program
17	content. So between those two things, importing a
18	distant public station, you're pretty much getting a
19	different service for your subscribers. It's got a
20	lot of choice to it, a lot of differentiation, both in
21	scheduling and in content.
22	JUDGE von KANN: Semi-unique? Is that

1	like being a little bit pregnant?
2	THE WITNESS: You may be right.
3	BY MR. HESTER:
4	Q Then if you move over to the next column,
5	where you see two or more local Public Television
6	stations carried on systems, could you describe again
7	what that column reflects?
8	A All right. Well, it's again, they are
9	getting at least one distant signal, distant public
10	station. But the cable operator has chosen to have at
11	least two local stations.
12	And I think this is even further proof of
13	the value of the distant signals because of the
14	this differentiation I was talking about a moment ago,
15	this semi-unique quality or whatever the phrase is.
16	It's valuable to bring it in. Even if you've got two
17	or more local stations, it's valuable to the cable
18	operator to import distant signals because of the
19	variety.
20	Q Now, Mr. Fuller, if you could just, then,
21	give us the synopsis of what these percentages reflect
22	in terms of total Form 3 cable subscribers that are

1	receiving a distant Public Television signal? Just
2	walk us through what those numbers would be.
3	A Well, just very simply, there is about ten
4	percent, I believe, in all. If you were to sum all of
5	these, the three data columns, not the total column
6	but the first, second, and third. That's about ten
7	percent of all cable subscribers are getting at least
8	one distant PTV signal.
9	The first column, which is no locals but
10	they're only PTV by distant. That's a little under 4
11	percent, about 3.6 percent, I think. There's close to
12	2.1 million of it. And then if you looked at those
13	that have locals, the second and third columns, they
14	total up to around four million. So that's around
15	seven percent, I believe, or getting at least a
16	distant plus several locals.
17	JUDGE von KANN: Columns 2 and 3 total
18	approximately seven percent?
19	THE WITNESS: That is right.
20	JUDGE von KANN: And Column 1 is about how
21	much?
22	THE WITNESS: About 3.6 percent.

JUDGE von KANN: Thank you. 1 2 BY MR. HESTER: And you had discussed before the number of 3 23 percent of Form 3 systems. I just wanted now to 4 circle back to that to fit it together, the percentage 5 the percentage 6 systems versus Form And just if you can put them both subscribers. 7 together? 8 9 Well, I am not sure how to say it any Α 10 differently. The number of systems is -- as a total is greater than the number of subscribers, 23 percent 11 versus 10 percent in this exhibit, which, of course, 12 13 the key thing here is the number of decisions made by cable operators. 14 So you've got a large, relatively large, 15 16 number of cable operators making the decision to have a distant PTV signal, even though many of them are 17 smaller systems with not so many subscribers. 18 19 Okay. Let me ask you just to follow up a little bit more on the point you made about the 20 content and schedule diversity of different Public 21 22 Television signals. If you could turn to page 5 of

1	your testimony?
2	A All right.
3	Q At the bottom paragraph on page 5, you
4	talk about scheduling diversity of different Public
5	Television stations. Do you see that?
6	A Yes.
7	Q And then you have a sentence in the middle
8	of the paragraph that says, "My own experience and
9	research suggest that repeat telecasts on Public
10	Television are largely additive." Do you see that?
11	A Right. Yeah, I do.
12	Q I wanted you to expand on that a little
13	bit, explain what you mean when you refer to your own
14	experience and research and explain what you're
15	talking about in a little more detail there.
16	A Well, at PBS, we have wondered about the
17	value of repeats over the years. And I do mean over
18	the years, for many years, actually. Should we be
19	repeating programs more to get more value out of them.
20	And so we have done a number of special
21	Nielsen studies that are called only, only, both.
22	They compare the audience of program A with program B

2 watched just A or just B. And A and B are the same JUDGE YOUNG: 3 4 program? It could be or may not be, 5 THE WITNESS: but in this case, it is. It's the same show. So 6 7 we're trying to find out, are we picking up an additional audience? What we found time and time 8 9 again is that -- and this is on a household basis, not 10 even a person basis, that somewhere in the 8 to 12 percent range does see both. But the rest don't. 11 12 So it's close to -- I'm sorry -- 90 13 percent are totally different audiences. haven't done this, but I'm sure that if you did such 14 an analysis on a person's basis, you would find that 15 16 the overlap goes down even further because I think if 17 the same household tunes into the program twice, -- as I said, around 8 to 12 percent of them do -- you might 18 find that it's the husband one time and the wife the 19 next time that are watching this program, rather than 20 the same person. 21 So there's a lot to be gained from showing

to see what percent watched both and which percent

22

1	a program twice. And so that's why I say that the
2	audiences are largely additive.
3	BY MR. HESTER:
4	Q We had discussed yesterday and it's also
5	referred to in your testimony the amount of original
6	and first-run programming on Public Television.
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q I wanted you to talk about the value of
9	that programming, in particular, in terms of cable
10	operators importing distant signals.
11	JUDGE von KANN: Can I ask a question on
12	the peak? It sounds like what you're saying is sort
13	of common sense. It would seem to me if the same
14	program is run at a later time later in the week, not
15	too many people who saw it the first time are going to
16	watch it again, maybe a few, but some significant
17	number of people who had a schedule conflict the first
18	time or heard from somebody, "Hey, there was a great
19	show. You are going to tune in."
20	I wouldn't think this would be unique to
21	PBS. And I guess I would ask you a little bit about
22	that. Why wouldn't this be a phenomenon that might

apply to any number of the claimant groups? 1 We sometimes see a movie is run Sunday 2 night, and then it's run again later in the week or 3 perhaps a particular broadcast, commercial show is 4 Wouldn't this be a phenomenon pretty much 5 across the board, that if somebody has the capacity to 6 7 repeat a program, they're probably going to pick up a significant number of new viewers? 8 9 THE WITNESS: I don't have a lot of evidence on that because we mostly focus on our own 10 11 stuff, but I will do the common sense thing here that I believe that it probably varies by genre. 12 The movies are a great example of where 13 no, you're not going to turn around and watch the same 14 movie again. 15 JUDGE von KANN: Right. 16 But if it's a situation 17 THE WITNESS: comedy, you might. My wife is so sick of me watching 18 I cannot get enough of Seinfeld. And I've 19 seen each episode seven or eight times. 20 This is a small addiction, but I'll admit it, nevertheless. 21 22 JUDGE YOUNG: Let me ask you one question

1	on that point.
2	THE WITNESS: Sure.
3	JUDGE YOUNG: On page 5, you refer to that
4	research and experience. At least the preceding
5	sentence relates specifically to kids' programming.
6	Is the result different when you look at children's
7	programming, as opposed to other programming? In
8	other words, was there a great incidence of watching
9	the same program twice if you are focusing on
LO	children's programs?
L1	THE WITNESS: That is a good question. I
L2	honestly don't recall. I know we have done some
L3	children's studies over the years. It could be a
L4	little bit higher overlap with children, knowing the
L5	way children watch television. But I just don't
L6	recall the percentages.
-7	BY MR. HESTER:
8	Q But this point you're making here, Mr.
_9	Fuller, relates to the benefits of schedule diversity
20	if there are different
21	A Overall.
22	Q Public Television signals coming into

1	a particular cable system?
2	A That is right. It's a general statement
3	about the whole schedule, really, is that in general,
4	yes, the audiences are largely additive. There is a
5	lot of unduplicated audience between airings of the
6	same program.
7	Q I wanted to ask you to turn over to page
8	7 of your testimony. In the middle paragraph, there
9	is a sentence about your evaluation of the rates of
10	duplication of schedules.
11	And in this paragraph or this section,
12	you're talking about your study of schedule
13	duplication. And you say, "I'm confident that similar
14	low rates of duplication would be achieved for the
15	1998-99 period if I were to duplicate the complete
16	study you had done before." Do you see that?
17	A I do.
18	Q I wanted to ask you to elaborate on that
19	point and explain the reasons why you're confident
20	that there would be these similar low rates of
21	duplication.
22	A Sure. One of my exhibits I've

of this. Using a computer program years ago, a mainframe computer program that no longer worked, I had to do the more recent tabulation by hand, which was tedious and smaller.

We set up this computer program to compare the program schedules of stations in pairs. So if, for example, in a given market, you would have station A and station B, the computer would look at the unique program code. PBS would have a code for every program just so we could keep track of it so we don't have to use titles, which can get misspelled.

So it compares these alpha codes to see if there is a match. And every time we do this, as far as, you know, head to head, this type of analysis that I presented, meaning they aired at the same time. Somewhere around 90 percent of the time, they do not.

And we have done this same study with many different stations, many different markets over the years repeatedly for this proceeding and just for our own use. And it always comes out about the same that because public stations have so much flexibility in

when they schedule things, that there's just not very much lining up.

Now, there would be on a head to head basis. Now, there is a little more in prime time, a little more, but, even then, stations, as John Wilson said, have the flexibility to slip programs around in prime time. We just ask them to air it on the night we feed it for certain designated programs.

But for the entire broadcast state, the duplication on a head to head basis is very small. And you have a sentence at the end of your footnote 2 on page 7 where you say that even the figure you just quoted tends to overstate the amount of duplication. I wanted you to elaborate on that point.

A Sure. This says seven percent. It's citing one part of my exhibit. As I said, it varies up to as much as 12 percent. But the point is I mentioned those unique program codes. Those are only for the series or if it's a special, you know, one-time-only special, well, of course, the code applies to that one program, but in the case of a series, there will be a four-alpha code for that but

nothing -- but our software does not look at the 1 2 episode within that series. For example, it might be NOVA, but it 3 could be the program about rockets to the moon or it 4 could be about DNA or something else. So our software 5 does not look for exact matches on episode. 6 gives the benefit of the doubt. 7 If they are head to head, they could 8 9 really be different episodes. But our software treats them as if they're a head to head occurrence and 10 counts them in this tabulation. 11 12 I hope that made sense. 13 Q So in other words, you would be counting as a duplication NOVA on two signals when, in fact, 14 there might be different episodes on the two signals? 15 Exactly right. 16 17 Let me ask you to turn over to page 8. Q Indeed, again, what you 18 JUDGE von KANN: 19 are saying here assumes to me to be sort of just 20 It's hard to see why a cable operator common sense. who has a scarce number of channels to use would 21 utilize one to book a duplicate of something he has 22

already got. 1 So presumably they do it because there is 2 some significant you say as much as 90 percent 3 variation. I mean, it wouldn't make much sense to use 4 up your channel to just duplicate what you have 5 already got, I would assume. 6 WITNESS: That is correct. Ι 7 THE 8 certainly agree. JUDGE von KANN: 9 Okay. BY MR. HESTER: 10 Mr. Fuller, I wanted to ask you to turn 11 Q over to page 8. There's a sentence at the bottom of 12 that section right before the heading for part 4 where 13 you say, "When more than one signal is available in a 14 given market, the stations of their own accord will 15 16 invariably take steps to distinguish their programming mix and schedule." Do you see that? 1.7 Yes, I do. 18 Α I just wanted you to talk a little bit 19 0 about that, what are the drivers that lead stations of 20 their own accord to vary their programming mix and 21 22 schedule.

idea of this is the Well, 1 Α counter-programming. In Public Television, we have --2 well, this goes back to what I said earlier when I 3 mentioned that we had about 342 transmitters in the 4 5 United States. So because of that -- and there are far 6 fewer television markets. There are 210 the last time 7 I looked markets. So in any given market, there often 8 is more than one Public Television station in that 9 10 market. 11 So what are they going to do? Are they 12 going to air the exact same thing at the same time? No. So they will slide programs around to avoid each 13 14 other. I mean, you can see it in the Washington 15 Post TV booklet that comes out every week looking at 16 17 the Maryland station versus WETA. Of course, you've got WHUT, which is doing something entirely different 18 19 because they're a different type of operation. But even WETA and WMPT are on many nights 20 slipping their programs away from each other a little. 21 If we feed, say, Frontline at 9:00, one of them may 22

1	air Frontline at 9:00 and the other one at 10:00. So
2	that's mainly what I was referring to there.
3	Q And they also look for different
4	programming content, in addition to slipping
5	schedules?
6	A They will do that with their own
7	acquisitions and productions. Of course, they will.
8	I mean, there are different program managers at each
9	station. And they want to look different.
LO	I mean, if they are competing well,
L1	competing. They are trying to get audiences in the
_2	same market. They I mean, it's just business sense
.3	to offer a different kind of service.
.4	JUDGE von KANN: Do they contact one
.5	another to do that? I don't want to raise any
-6	antitrust issues or whatever there might be. Does
.7	this just happen to work out miraculously or do they
.8	tend to
.9	THE WITNESS: Well, in the television
20	business, you just try to find out the best way you
21	can, you know, by knowing somebody or hearing what the
22	other person is doing. I don't know whether they talk

1	or not. I really don't. You find out the best way
2	you can.
3	JUDGE YOUNG: You were here for the Wilson
4	testimony yesterday.
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	JUDGE YOUNG: And I assume you heard him
7	refer to I forget the right, proper words, but
8	instead of an agreement, informal agreement, to try to
9	coordinate better prime time. Is that affecting these
10	results?
11	THE WITNESS: That's what I was referring
12	to just a moment ago, but I don't think I used the
13	term, the common carriage agreement.
14	JUDGE YOUNG: Right.
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, that's in prime time.
16	And that would have the effect of, well
17	JUDGE YOUNG: Is that what you're
18	referring to maybe doing Frontline at 10:00, as
19	opposed to 9:00 or Frontline at 8:00?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, yes, because the
21	agreement only asks stations to air a designated
22	program. First of all, PBS designates about 500 hours

of programming a year for common carriage. That's out 1 of something like 1,100 in prime time. 2 Of those that are designated, all the 3 station is asked to do is air the program on the night 4 that PBS feeds it on the satellite within prime time. 5 So if we feed a program at 8:00, they have 6 7 the flexibility at the stations of slipping it to 8:30, to 9:00, to 9:30, 10:00, whatever works for 8 9 them. That's it. 10 JUDGE YOUNG: And what about in the morning, where presumably most PBS stations want to 11 12 attract kids? There's only a certain number of 13 programs you have. Do they tend to have duplication 14 there? There actually is not very 15 THE WITNESS: 16 much. The stations truly exercise their right to 17 flexibility in the daytime. And part of that is -part of the reason for that is because some of them 18 19 will break away in the middle of the day. Now, even though PBS feeds a solid block 20 of children's programming from 7:00 in the morning 21 22 until 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, some stations

will break away around the middle to offer adult 1 programming because most children are in school, at 2 least older children, not -- many of the preschoolers 3 are in preschool. 4 So you may have adult learning courses 5 inserted in or maybe repeats of Masterpiece Theatre, 6 that sort of thing, a little block right in the 7 middle. So that means they're not using some of the 8 9 children's programming we feed. So that being the case, that makes it 10 11 possible for them to then slip programs around, move them back and forth and pick and choose. And because 12 of that, you don't have very much, I mean, really very 13 14 little head to head during daytime. JUDGE YOUNG: And the last question is, 15 for your informal survey in 1999, how did you select 16 17 the 15 or so markers you looked at? Well, it was truly on an 1.8 THE WITNESS: 19 informal basis. I had a printout listing cable 20 systems. I believe it was a Larson printout. And I just went through trying to geographically disburse 21 the ones that appeared so that I didn't have them all

bunched in the New England or bunched in the South or 1 And I just manually picked them. 2 whatever. That's why it's called informal. It's not 3 a scientific sampling design. 4 5 BY MR. HESTER: And even though you did this on an 6 informal basis, were the conclusions consistent with 7 8 what you would have expected and what you had seen in 9 your earlier, more rigorous study? 10 Α That is right. It comes out the same. And we had had so much experience with this in the 11 past I really didn't feel disturbed by using an 12 13 informal sampling system. And it didn't come out 14 different. I mean, if it had been radically different, I think I would have gone back to the 15 16 drawing board. But it's the same story. Let me ask you to clarify one point on the 17 common carriage agreement. Even as to the common 18 19 carriage agreement, particular stations are able to decide that they are not going to follow what is 20 suggested in terms of the common carriage. 21 22 right?

There's two conditions where that happens that I recall. One is we -- I think John mentioned this yesterday, John Wilson, that there was a class of membership of PBS that -- well, he might not have mentioned this term. Program differentiation policy is what it's called. I think it comes from our membership committee or it's a PDP station. And they pay one-fourth, I believe, the dues of other stations and get one-fourth the programming that full member stations get.

So right there you have a big differentiation in schedule because they have to go out and find the other three-fourths programming on their own.

The other one is when a station requests a waiver of the PBS board's membership committee because there are two stations in the market or three stations or whatever it is and they don't want to do the same thing, they don't want to be required to air the same thing as the major station. So they demonstrate that their case to the membership committee, which then votes whether or not to allow

this waiver -- and if they do, then the station is 1 2 exempt from common carriage. And we have a number of them. 3 remember the number, but there's a number of them. 4 And, of course, they're in markets where there's 5 several public stations at a time. 6 7 JUDGE von KANN: One last thing. Ιf you've got a cable system that is carrying its local 8 Public Television station and it decides it wants to 9 get a second one that is going to be a distant signal, 10 we've sort of been talking here about Baltimore and 11 12 Washington, another one. 13 THE WITNESS: Sure. JUDGE von KANN: I quess the operator 14 could choose any Public Television station around the 15 It doesn't have to be one that's -- they 16 country. 17 could go to WGBH in Boston, --18 THE WITNESS: Right. JUDGE von KANN: -- which I think is sort 19 20 of regarded as a particularly fine one. stations tend to be a nearby station, sort of in the 21 same region, or is there --22

1	MR. HESTER: It's coming in the testimony.
2	JUDGE von KANN: Is it? Yes.
3	THE WITNESS: The answer is yes. They do
4	tend to be regional. And the reason for that is
5	because people, viewers apparently this makes sense
6	to me want to see regional types of programming.
7	You know, if a station is producing like
8	local news or local nature shows or local public
9	affairs or like here in Washington we have a local
10	arts program and you're in Fredericksburg, for
11	example, that would be of interest because you can
12	come to Washington and, you know, enjoy the performing
13	arts here if it's an art show.
14	So the answer is yes. I don't know if
15	I'm sure there are a few isolated examples of
16	importing something really, really distant, but I just
17	personally don't know of any. I think it's quite
18	rare.
19	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
20	BY MR. HESTER:
21	Q And just to follow up on that briefly, Mr.
22	Fuller, if you look at the top of 6, this is where you
	1

discuss that. 1 2 Page 6? 3 Yes. Well, yeah, virtually all carried 4 5 a signal from a nearby city. And the first sentence in the paragraph, 6 if you might just elaborate on that a bit, where you 7 talk about providing the programming of regional 8 interest that the smaller local stations are unable to 9 10 produce? If you could just talk about that a bit? Well, when there is a difference like 11 Α that, I was talking -- talked a little about the 12 13 regional appeal. But if you're talking about a station that's in a small county with a small -- some 14 15 distance away from a large city, sure, the station is qoing to be operating on a small budget and they're 16 17 not producing. It's very expensive to maintain a studio 18 and a staff of production people. 19 Even a lot of commercial stations have gotten out of that. So yes, 20 you could then import programs that they could never 21 22 produce themselves because the signal is coming, the

1	distant signal is coming, from a major market where
2	the station is better-heeled, they've had more funding
3	and they have a production staff.
4	Q So we discussed yesterday an example of a
5	Buffalo station that was televising the Buffalo
6	Philharmonic that was going around to cable systems in
7	western New York.
8	A Right.
9	Q Would that be an example of the
10	phenomenon?
11	A That's a perfect example. I mean, that
12	would be a very expensive production to put on,
13	multiple cameras with a remote pickup and whatnot.
1.4	No, a small station would never do anything like that.
15	Q So that's an example of adding diversity
16	and programming content by importing the distant
17	signal?
18	A Of course.
19	Q Let me ask you to turn over to a
20	discussion on children's programming at pages 8 to 9.
21	JUDGE von KANN: This last point suggested
22	clustering doesn't apply only to commercial TV

1	stations. Perhaps it's a similar kind of issue. It
2	don't know.
3	BY MR. HESTER:
4	Q At the bottom of 8, you refer to the
5	unique and unparalleled children's programming on
6	Public Television. I wanted you simply to elaborate
7	on that a bit, please.
8	A Well, "unique and unparalleled," it all
9	begins with the fact of our mission. We are an
10	educational broadcasting service. And nowhere is that
11	clearer than in our children's programming.
12	We are not providing children's
13	programming just to amuse children. I mean, they can
14	go elsewhere for just pure amusement. There's
15	something lurking behind all of our children's shows.
16	Because we're noncommercial, there's, of
17	course, a benefit there in that there are not
18	commercials inserted in this educational programming
19	that will cause the children to go screaming to their
20	parents for expensive toys or for sugar-coated cereals
21	or that sort of thing.

So if a parent wants a child, say, a

three-year-old, four-year-old, whatever to sit down and watch a little television that is good for them, they don't have to worry about the commercials that are going to be force-fed on them.

Another thing is that our programming, as I said, it's educational. And this is what I think makes our service unique because it's totally educational, not that there aren't some other channels that have a little educational programming, but ours totally are.

And we address not only some -- I don't know if this is appropriate to say for small children but curricular type things, learning numbers and counting and vocabulary and whatnot, but also there is like social, psychological content focusing on how to help the child understand his or her place in the world, how to get along with others, how to understand, how to react when their feelings are hurt, that sort of thing. I mean, Fred Rogers was, of course, the past master of that, but we have lots of other stuff, other shows that feature that same kind of thing.

1	This service does have substantial content
2	for little children, the preschoolers, but we have
3	also been expanding into the older children area. And
4	now we have programming for the six to
5	eight-year-olds, some a little older than that even.
6	Q And is that programming of an educational
7	nature directed at older children something that is
8	hard to find elsewhere in television?
9	A I would certainly say yes. Again, that is
10	our mission. And there is very little of it
11	elsewhere.
12	JUDGE GULIN: Back in '98-'99, was
13	Nickelodeon would you consider that a children's
14	educational
15	THE WITNESS: For the most
16	JUDGE GULIN: or was that more kind of
17	entertaining we're talking about?
18	THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon. It is
19	largely entertainment. They did start a service
20	called Nick Jr., which is I don't know the length
21	of it, but it's an hour or two, I think, in the
22	morning. It does have some similar content.

1	JUDGE GULIN: So you wouldn't consider
2	Nickelodeon to be a look-alike back in '98 and '99?
3	THE WITNESS: No on the basis of
4	proportion. You know, they're primarily an
5	entertainment service.
6	BY MR. HESTER:
7	Q And could you just describe a little bit
8	more about the target audience of Nick Jr.?
9	A My understanding and recollection is that
10	it's preschoolers.
11	Q So it didn't address the older children?
12	A Not Nick Jr., no.
13	Q On page 10 if I can direct you there, in
14	the middle of the page, you say that children are avid
15	viewers of PBS programming. Could you discuss that in
16	a little more detail?
17	A Well, the idea of them being avid viewers
18	is inferred from comments that we have gotten over the
19	years from parents, from the results of surveys, where
20	they discuss how parents discuss how their children
21	love the programming, how much they like it, and then,
,,	of course the fact that a lot of them watch it We

know that from surveys, Nielsen surveys. 1 2 So all of those things in combination, I think, have given us the feeling that our programming 3 4 is valued by the viewer, the parents. 5 And you say in the next paragraph, first line, "Many parents are insistent about the 6 7 value and necessity of children's programming on 8 Public Television." I wondered if you could elaborate on what you mean by that and why you say that. 9 Well, in addition to the informal contact 10 Α 11 that we have with parents and our stations have with 12 fact many parents and the that make parents 13 contributions to their local stations to support, they will mention the children service, we also have seen 14 survey results that we have conducted over the years 15 in which they give high scores to Public Television 16 17 for the children's service. But it's important to them that it's well-done, that it really applies to us 18 19 in a strong way. 20 I wanted now to turn and talk about the relevance of all of this to assessing the value of 21

Public Television distant signals for cable operators.

If you could talk about that a bit?

A Well, in sum, I think we have a valuable high-quality, in many ways unique service that a cable operator would be remiss if not offering it. We have discussed a number of things: the variety of the schedule; the variety of content' the educational content of the children's programming, educational in various levels; the stimulating content that we provide in our prime time programming.

There are genres that we offer for adults that are not easily found on other networks. While there are cable networks over the years that have begun making a living off copying some of our more population genres, there still is not very much to be found off the top of my mind in the public affairs area.

I think we are past masters in public affairs, news, and documentaries. This is out of the '98-'99 period, but just a couple of weeks ago, we had that eight-hour Avoiding Armageddon mini series, which was all about various forms of domestic terrorism. And I don't see anything like that popping up.

1	We do this kind of thing on a regular
2	basis. Others may do it every rare now and then. But
3	you take all of this together, and I think a Public
4	Television signal is really a necessity for the
5	business of the cable operator.
6	Q I wanted to go back just one more time on
7	the issue about children's programming, in particular.
8	At page 9, you say that 28 percent of all households
9	in the U.S. had children under the age of 12.
10	What relevance does that have in terms of
11	assessing the value of Public Television signals as
12	distant signals for cable operators?
13	A Well, it's the fact that a lot of their
14	customers, over a fourth of their customers, are going
15	to be keen on having the programming of Public
16	Television.
17	That's a it's a large market segment to
18	ignore. So I would think a cable operator would have
19	to have this content.
20	Q Let me ask you to turn to page 19 of your
21	testimony, please, Mr. Fuller. This is where you
22	discuss the survey presented or developed by WTBS. I

wanted you to describe that survey, just the general method, and discuss it a little bit. And then we can drill down into some particulars.

A Okay. Well, I would like to say right off the bat that the reason we have included this is because it's not unlike -- I mean, it's an example of any number of surveys that we have seen where PBS is scored high on attributes and on program genres. And this is just one example of it.

This was a study that was conducted with about 1,200 cable subscribers. And the respondents, these cable subscriber respondents, were asked to indicate using a scale from -5 to +5, +5 being the strongest degree of liking, how they felt about a list of program types, genres, and program attributes or channel attributes that was presented to them by the researchers. And that's the methodology.

So they went through all of these and scored each one of them. And then the WTBS researchers were able to rank all of these attributes, which is what is in our exhibit, from highest to lowest score.

1	Q And let me direct you now to that exhibit,
2	exhibit 11. Does this reflect the results?
3	A Yeah. This is what I was talking about.
4	These are the results.
5	Q Let's make sure we're all on the right
6	page. It's the fourth page in. Is that right, where
7	the results begin?
8	A Yeah. It's the stack of horizontal bar
9	graphs. That's what I'm looking at.
10	Q Okay. Mr. Fuller, if you could just talk
11	through what the various columns of information are
12	here?
13	A All right. Starting at the very left is
14	the ranking for each of these attributes or genres.
15	Then the attribute is described.
16	Q Let me ask you to pause there. So this
17	includes attributes and program types. Is that what
18	is reflected in this column?
19	A It's attributes and content types, I
20	should say.
21	Q So could you just give a few examples just
22	so we're all

1	A Sure.
2	Q on the same page in terms of tracking
3	it?
4	A Well, the very first one is an attribute,
5	high-quality programs, followed by limited commercial
6	interruption. Then you skip down through it. And you
7	can see programs about animal and wildlife at number
8	13. Number 15 is mystery shows. So those are
9	examples of genres. Nineteen, good, old-fashioned
10	programming, that's an attribute and so forth.
11	So there's this long list of these. So is
12	that enough or
13	Q Yes.
L4	A Now I'd like to hop around just a little
L5	bit and say and remind everyone that this these
L6	scores are based on that -5 to +5 scale that was
L7	provided to the respondents. So they select a number.
L8	They could have said, "Oh, good,
L9	old-fashioned programming, I'd give that a -3" or
20	"Science programs, I'll give it a +5" or whatever.
21	Then they add them up and average. And the average
22	score is shown in that column that says, "Average

attitude." 1 Then on the far right, the researchers 2 have grouped some of the scores and percentaged them 3 so that you can see how many people chose scores that 4 fell in these ranges of the scale. So, for example, 5 the percent that shows what the researchers call 6 7 unfavorable, which was any score from -5 to -3, you can see the percent running down that column, like .3 8 9 percent. 10 The one in the middle they call neutral range, -2 to +2 and on the far right, the 11 12 percent that were considered to be favorable toward 13 that genre or attribute. And that's the +3 to +5 14 scale, 92 percent at the very top. So then they took those three numbers, 15 16 just looking at the top row, .3, 7.7, and 92.0. 17 they graphed it. And those numbers you just read out, .3, 18 Q 19 7.7, and 92.0, are for the first attribute, --For that first attribute. 20 Α -- high-quality programming? 21 And they add to 100 percent. 22 Α

1	Q Okay.
2	A It's a distribution of those responses.
3	So, for example, high-quality programs, that long
4	black section of the bar graph is the 92.0 percent
5	that were favorable.
6	But if you then took all of the individual
7	scores, not forgetting the percentages for now,
8	just take the individual scores and average them.
9	That's the 4.3 that you see in the third column.
10	Q Okay.
11	A So that's how to read the tape.
12	Q So that in the shaded horizontal bar
13	chart, the darker bar that's over to the right-hand
14	side reflects the favorable?
15	A That's the favorable portion.
16	Q And the very dark shading which is on the
17	left-hand side reflects what?
18	A Unfavorable. And then the white portion
19	in the middle is, of course, the neutral section.
20	Q Okay. Could you just run through the top
21	rated attributes? Let's go one to ten and just
22	explain what those are.

1	A Okay. I'll translate them because they're
2	abbreviated. The one at the very top is high-quality
3	programs.
4	The second is limited commercial
5	interruptions.
6	Third is programs the family can watch,
7	presumably together.
8	Number four is a wide variety of
9	programming.
10	Five is programs that make you think.
11	Six is programs with something for all.
12	Number seven is programs that keep you
13	informed presumably, including news programs.
14	Number eight is educational programming
15	for children. Nine is a predictable schedule.
16	Number ten is programs that are not
17	available on any of the networks. And by that, I
18	believe they mean the major networks, like ABC, NBC,
19	CBS, and Fox.
20	So those are the top ten. Then it goes on
21	from there.
22	Q And so the top-rated attribute, again,

1	was?
2	A High-quality programs.
3	Q Let me ask you to turn back a page from
4	the bar chart to the narrative that precedes it. Is
5	this the narrative that the WTBS researchers produced
6	along with this study?
7	A Yes.
8	Q I wanted just to point you to the
9	discussion at the top of the second page of the
10	narrative. Does this also talk about the results?
11	A Yes, it does. Do you want me to
12	paraphrase it or read it?
13	Q Well, I just wanted to focus on the
14	sentence, "More than anything else, subscribers seek
15	high-quality programming." Do you see that?
16	A Yes, I do.
17	Q Is that accord with the conclusions that
18	are then shown in these bar charts?
19	A Oh, exactly, yes, the number one
20	attribute.
21	Q How do these attributes fit together with
22	Public Television?

They're very familiar to us. They're 1 Α 2 largely the attributes that we get high scores for whenever we have done surveys of our own asking to 3 well several channel rated as as 4 have our 5 competitors'. And we typically get the high scores for 6 most of these same attributes, certainly high-quality 7 8

most of these same attributes, certainly high-quality programs and obviously limited commercial interruptions, programs the whole family can watch, a wide variety.

Programs that make you think is one of our highest-scoring attributes, phrased a little differently but the general idea; a program lineup that has something for everyone; information through news breaks, for example, like Maryland Public Television does; and obviously educational programs for children. So it's very similar to our own findings and describes Public Television very well.

Q How is that relevant or how is the fact of this survey relevant in terms of assessing the value of a Public Television distant signal to cable operators?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	A Well, again, it adds further support to
2	the necessity, I think, of having such a signal on
3	your cable system because of all of these sterling
4	qualities.
5	They are things that people have you
6	know, potential subscribers or current subscribers
7	have said they value. So, you know, as a business
8	proposition, you would obviously want to offer that to
9	your customers.
10	Q Mr. Fuller, when was this study done?
11	A It was done I think in '91. '91.
12	Q Could you explain whether these views
13	expressed by cable subscribers about their preferences
14	in terms of programming would still apply to the
15	1998-99 period?
16	A Well, this is these are views of
17	subscribers.
18	Q Right. Could you describe whether those
19	would still be applicable, in your judgment, during
20	the '98-'99 period?
21	A Oh, absolutely. I'm sure they would. As
22	I said, we see other data that corroborate this. And

1	we have been seeing it year after year. And it
2	parallels this right up through '98 and '99 and into
3	the present. It's pretty stable.
4	MR. HESTER: Thank you.
5	JUDGE von KANN: This survey was presented
6	by the program suppliers in the '90 to '92 proceeding?
7	THE WITNESS: That's right.
8	MR. HESTER: That is correct, Your Honor.
9	Those are all the questions I have. Thank
10	you, Mr. Fuller.
11	THE WITNESS: Sure.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: You know, you just said you
13	saw the data. You have described some of the data
14	with respect to children's programming. What other
15	data are you referring to with respect to
16	non-children's programming that would support your
17	statement that this applies?
18	THE WITNESS: Well, one off the top of my
19	head is for a number of years, we have conducted an
20	annual survey that we paid to have done of Public
21	Television's image, among other thing, images,
22	preferences. And we asked a number of attributes in

1	that survey. And they come out very similar to this.
2	JUDGE YOUNG: Is that a survey on what
3	is the survey?
4	THE WITNESS: Well, it's adults, 18 plus,
5	in the United States.
6	JUDGE YOUNG: Not necessarily PBS viewers?
7	THE WITNESS: No. It's all. There's no
8	filter on it. It's just adults, 18 plus, whatever
9	they whether or not they watch PBS, because we want
10	to know non-viewers think as well as viewers. It's
11	valuable to break them down that way.
12	MR. HESTER: Could I just follow up on one
13	point?
14	JUDGE von KANN: Sure.
15	BY MR. HESTER:
16	Q Mr. Fuller, I think there are sort of two
17	issues.
18	A Okay.
19	Q One is whether these attributes describe
20	Public Television. The second is whether these
21	preferences in terms of what cable subscribers want
22	would be applicable today.

1	And I wanted you to address the second
2	point as well in terms of
3	JUDGE YOUNG: That is where my question
4	THE WITNESS: I see. Right.
5	MR. HESTER: I think that is where you
6	were going, Judge Young.
7	THE WITNESS: Okay. I am doing this from
8	memory, but my recollection is that in our annual
9	survey that I have told you about, we have a breakdown
10	for cable and non-cable households.
11	And my recollection is that the cable
12	people who are cable subscribers have very similar
13	opinions to those who don't about Public Television.
14	It's strong. It's stable. It's been this way over
15	the years. So does that answer the question?
16	JUDGE YOUNG: Maybe I am getting a little
17	confused. You just made a statement in your
18	testimony. At footnote 19, you say, "Viewer
19	preferences have not significantly changed since the
20	TBS survey was conducted. The study still accurately
21	reflects those preferences."
22	And my question was the basis for that

1	statement, specific as to what surveys or studies you
2	are referring to.
3	THE WITNESS: Well, okay. I guess I
4	wasn't clear. I am referring to these other studies
5	that we have had conducted on our own. Plus, there is
6	a survey that was conducted every year by the Roper
7	organization that asks attributes and taking those
8	together.
9	And our study, our image study, plus the
LO	Roper survey and there may be others ask similar
L1	questions to the WTBS study. And those findings over
L2	the years have been pretty much the same. They have
L3	not changed very much. That is what I am basing that
L4	on.
L5	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Thanks.
L6	MR. HESTER: Thank you.
L7	JUDGE GULIN: I actually have about five
L8	minutes of questions. Maybe I will wait until after
L9	the cross.
20	JUDGE von KANN: I think yesterday we
21	started with NAB, and Mr. Lazarus had only a couple of
22	minutes. But I see a rather large stack of paper in

1	front of him today, which suggests to me he is going
2	to be longer. Is that probably right, he or you,
3	whichever one of you?
4	So why don't we break at this point for 15
5	minutes. And as to the consensus, we will follow the
6	same order as yesterday.
7	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
8	the record at 10:39 a.m. and went back on
9	the record at 10:55 a.m.)
10	JUDGE VON KANN: Okay, Mr. Stewart.
11	CROSS EXAMINATION
12	BY MR. STEWART:
13	Q Good morning, Mr. Fuller.
14	A Good morning, Mr. Stewart.
15	Q I'm John Stewart and I'm representing the
16	Commercial Television Station Claimants in this
17	proceeding. And my goal actually is to ask all the
18	questions that the Sports and Program Suppliers
19	lawyers would ask, but in a more succinct fashion.
20	(Laughter.)
21	A I thank you for that, Mr. Stewart.
22	Q Would you turn, please, to page 6 of your
i	

1	testimony?
2	A All right.
3	Q Here at the top of the page you talk about
4	the regional interest of certain programs on public
5	television stations?
6	A Yes, I see it.
7	Q And to ask the other sort of, the other
8	side of the coin of a question that Chairman Von Kanr
9	asked, the regional appeal effect is not limited to
10	public television stations, is it?
11	A No, of course not.
12	Q In fact, for commercial television
13	stations that produce programs that are local and
14	regional in appeal, those programs could also be
15	expected to have value in distant cable markets in the
16	same way that you describe here, correct?
17	A They would certainly have their own appeal
18	because of the regional nature. We make our own case,
19	of course, that we have a special type of programming
20	that's noncommercial and so forth. It has its own
21	particular appeal.
	1

That's separate from the regional --

Q

1	A Well, it's an aspect of the regional.
2	Q By that, you're referring to the no
3	commercial interruptions, is that the
4	A That's one, yes.
5	Q What are the others?
6	A Well, the content itself. If we have a
7	regional program produced, it's not going to be
8	well, it could be a sports program, but more likely
9	it's going to be some informative or educational type
10	of programming.
11	Q Would you turn to Exhibit 10, please, of
12	the PBS file.
13	Do you have that?
14	A I have it.
15	Q This is an exhibit submitted in connection
16	with Mr. Wilson's testimony that identifies examples
17	of local and regional programming on PBS stations, is
18	that right?
19	A That's right.
20	Q And if you could just look at the first
21	one there, Lamar, Colorado. Do you know do you
22	happen to know whether KRMA or KTSC is carried as a

1	distant station in Lamar, Colorado?
2	A I don't know off the top of my head.
3	Q Looking at the KRMA entry there, first
4	KRMA is from Denver, Colorado which is the largest
5	city in Colorado, correct?
6	A Denver?
7	Q Yes.
8	A Yes.
9	Q And they produced, first program listed
LO	here is the State of Colorado program State Political
L1	Coverage that airs twice in a week. Do you see that?
L2	A I see it.
L3	Q Now do commercial television stations
L4	produce programs that provide coverage as to state
L5	political affairs?
L6	A I'm trying to think what I've seen. They
L7	certainly produce local. And I don't recall with any
L8	certainty about state coverage.
.9	Q Do you think television stations in the
20	state capital cover events of political events
21	regarding state government?
22	A I would have to guess that that's probably

1	true.	
2	Q	And do you know whether, for example, in
3	the next lis	ting under KRMA, commercial stations also
4	produce prog	grams about regional travel?
5	A	I have no idea.
6	Q	Looking at KTSC, do you know whether
7	commercial	stations also create human interest
8	programs?	
9	A	Again, I don't know.
10	Q	Let's flip to the next page and look at
11	the Ashford,	Connecticut example that you have there.
12		Do you see that?
13	A	I do.
14	Q	Now the first listing under WEDH is for
15	Women's Coll	lege Basketball, do you see that?
16	A	Yes, I do.
17	Q	Is that basketball games?
18	A	Well, I'm not familiar with the program.
19	 Just looking	g at it, I would think it would be, rather
20	than say a	discussion of women's basketball, but I
21	truly don't	know.
22	Q	The next program under WEDH is listed as -

1	- is described as a talk show with the women's
2	basketball coach broadcast in conjunction with each
3	game. Do you see that?
4	A I see that.
5	Q I assume the word coast in the title
6	should probably have been Coach Genome.
7	A I wondered about that too. I don't know,
8	unless that's her first name, right?
9	Q Could be. Are you aware of whether
10	commercial television has talk shows with sports
L1	coaches, broadcast in conjunction with games?
12	A Yes, they do.
13	Q And this being an exhibit that talks about
L4	local and regional programming, do you believe that
15	this these programs on WEDH would have some
16	particular appeal within the region in which the
L7	stations carry it as a distant signal?
L8	A You're asking if I think they would have -
L9	- this WGBH program would have appeal say out in
20	Ashford, Connecticut as a distant signal?
21	Q WEDH.
22	A Oh, I beg your pardon. I'm sorry, then

1	I've misund	erstood you. Would you ask it again?
2	Q	Do you think the two programs we just
3	discussed,	college basketball games and the Coach
4	Genome Show	would have appeal within the region in
5	which WEDH	is carried as a distant signal?
6	A	In the region, yes.
7	Q	And perhaps not outside the region?
8	A	Correct.
9	Q	Now turning to the next page of Exhibit
10	10, you see	the Rennselear, Indiana example there?
11	A	I see it.
12	Q	And under WTTW, the second program,
13	Chicago Thi	s Week, is described as a local new wrap
14	program tha	t airs Friday nights, do you see that?
15	A	I do.
16	Q	Are you familiar with that program?
17	A	No.
18	Q	But it appears to air just once a week, is
19	that right?	
20	A	That's right.
21	Q	Are you aware of whether WGN, for example,
22	from Chicag	o, produces and broadcasts news programs

1	from Chicago?
2	A I don't know.
3	Q I want to just hand you a first of all,
4	is it your view that in the Rennselear, Indiana area
5	local news from Chicago, that program from WTTW would
6	be of value to the cable operators to subscribers?
7	A That particular program, the one called
8	what was it, Chicago This Week?
9	Q Yes.
10	A I would think it would be. Again,
11	referring back to that example I gave earlier about
12	say Fredericksburg versus Washington, I don't really
13	know the area around Chicago and I don't know how far
14	away Rennselear is, but if it were not more than 50 or
15	60 miles as a distant signal, I would think sure,
16	people would be interested in what's going on in
17	Chicago.
18	Q In fact, that's part of the point you make
19	on page 6 of your testimony about the region appeal of
20	locally produced PBS programs, correct?
21	A Right.
22	Q I want to hand you, I'm sorry I only have

1	one copy with me, an exhibit presented by the Public
2	Television Claimants which is PTB Exhibit 12-X which
3	is a program schedule for the national feed of WGN.
4	This is the program schedule that would appear to the
5	cable subscribers who receive WGN as a distant signal.
6	Would you confirm that there is WGN news
7	at noon on every weekday on that schedule?
8	A I see that, from 12 to 1.
9	Q And there's also another news program in
10	the evening, see that?
11	A Nine to 10 p.m.
12	Q It's a 9 p.m. WGN news program?
13	A Yes.
14	Q And there's also news on the weekends, is
15	that right?
16	A Yes, I see it.
17	Q WGN News at Nine as well?
18	A Uh-huh, Saturday and Sunday.
19	Q Now is there any reason from your
20	perspective that a daily news program from Chicago on
21	WGN as a distant signal would be any less valuable
22	than the WTTW once a week news program from Chicago?
j	I and the second

1	A You mean as a distant signal, is it
2	carried all over the country? I've never watched
3	their newscast. In fact, we don't get WGN on my cable
4	system. So I don't what they're putting in it.
5	If it were truly local Chicago news, it
6	would have no interest to me or I should think many
7	people all around the country, but if they recast the
8	content of the news so that it was more national in
9	scope, then that would have probably some appeal, no
10	matter the location within the United States.
11	Q Just for the moment, we're talking about
12	Rennselear, Indiana. You've raised Rennselear as an
13	example in which Chicago news on a distant PBS signal
14	would be of interest to the cable subscribers there,
15	is that right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And my question to you is whether in the
18	same circumstances if WGN were a distant signal in
19	that system, WGN's local news from Chicago would be
20	similarly valuable?
21	A As I said, it depends on the content.
22	Q Okay.

1	A If it's local content, regional content,
2	yes.
3	Q Okay, and by the way, do you know whether
4	it's typical for the evening news program on a
5	commercial station to air at 9 p.m.?
6	A That's not typical.
7	Q When is it typical?
8	A Typical is the first hour after prime
9	time. That's in the middle of prime.
10	Q And now looking back at Exhibit 10, you've
11	got a WYIN listed below WTTW, do you see that?
12	A I do.
13	Q And there again, you list live coverage
14	basketball games. Do you see that?
15	A I do.
16	Q And is that again likely to be of interest
17	within the region where the teams are located? Is
18	that the point of this listing?
19	A Well, I have to make an assumption and
20	that's that college basketball games are local
21	colleges and if that's the case, then the answer is
22	yes, it would have appeal, I should think, in

1	Rennselear, local or regional colleges.
2	Q Okay, now the one above that, Hagerstown,
3	Maryland, do you see that?
4	A I do.
5	Q And you have this is the program, one
6	of the programs you mentioned in your testimony, the
7	arts program from WETA.
8	A There it is, Around Town.
9	Q Okay, and that you say is potentially
10	valuable to cable systems within the region where WETA
11	would be carried as a distant signal because it would
12	provide information to people who might travel to
13	Washington to attend one of these arts programs?
14	A Exactly what I said.
15	Q And now WWPB, do you know where that's
16	I guess that station is Maryland Public Television's
17	Hagerstown transmitter.
18	A That's what it is.
19	Q Okay, first one is News Night Maryland, do
20	you see that?
21	A I do.
22	Q A regional news program that airs twice

1	each weeknight. Are you familiar with that program?
2	A I've heard of it. I don't think I've
3	watched it.
4	Q Okay. Do you know how long it is?
5	A No.
6	Q Now again, and that is valuable to cable
7	operators because the cable operators where that's
8	received are in the State of Maryland, is that right?
9	A The cable operators where this station is
10	received are in the State of Maryland?
11	Q Yes.
12	A Well, there could also be some ir
13	Pennsylvania as well or Virginia.
14	Q Would that program be of interest of
15	subscribers in either of those locations?
16	A As I said earlier, as long as it's not too
17	far away, you know, yes, it would be.
18	Q Okay, now by the same token, wouldn't it
19	be the case that news about events in the State of
20	Maryland from, for example, WJZ, a commercial station
21	in Baltimore would be of interest to cable operators
22	and subscribers in that region?

1	A Yes.
2	Q Turning to page 9 of your testimony, you
3	talk there about children under 12, households with
4	children under 12 in 1999 representing about 28
5	percent of all households?
6	A Yes, I see that.
7	Q And why was that significant from your
8	perspective?
9	A Because it's a large segment of the
10	population and therefore should be of concern to cable
11	operators to address their interests as a business.
12	Q Now the children under 12 don't themselves
13	make the decision whether to subscribe to cable?
14	A No.
15	Q Have you done or are you aware of any
16	research about who the decision maker is with respect
17	to cable subscription?
18	A I don't think so. I don't believe I've
19	seen that.
20	Q In those cases, presumably, the head of
21	household, the parent would be responsible for
22	deciding whether to subscribe to cable and whether to

1	maintain a si	abscription to cable?
2	A S	Yes, one or more, one or both parents.
3	Q	Turning to page 19 of your testimony
4	A 2	All right.
5	Q .	There you talk about this survey done for
6	WTBS?	
7	A	That's correct.
8	Q i	And Exhibit 11 was a few pages from that
9	survey, corre	ect?
10	A	Correct.
11	Q :	I'd like to introduce as NAB Exhibit Demo.
12	9.	
13		(Whereupon, the above-referred
14		to document was marked as NAB
15		98-99 Demonstrative 9 for
16		identification.)
17		A larger collection of excerpts from the
18	study itself	•
19		(Pause.)
20	-	This was originally a cross examination
21	exhibit in the	e 1990 proceeding, when Mr. Sieber first
22	presented tes	stimony about this study. It then was put

1	in as a direct case exhibit number 4 by NAB in the
2	1990-92 case, so I don't know how what the record
3	will ultimately be about with exhibit labels, but
4	we've added number 3 here.
5	A Okay.
6	Q And this actually constitutes sort of
7	chunks of the underlying study itself, the report that
8	was provided to WTBS about which Mr. Sieber tstified
9	and if you would just follow through with me,
10	unfortunately, the pages are not numbered, but there's
11	you can flip through the pages. There's a table of
12	contents, followed by a page labeled background and
13	objections, Section 1. The second page under that
14	describes the specific objectives of the research
15	project. Do you see that, it's labeled
16	A I found it.
17	Q And the first three have to do with
18	acquiring information about TBS' perceived images,
19	strengths and weaknesses and so on. Do you see that?
20	A I do.
21	Q The fourth bullet is to determine what
22	viewers and nonviewers want and do not want from a

1	cable network and the fifth and sixth have to do with
2	identifying gaps in the marketplace and potential
3	strategic recommendations for positioning TBS. Do you
4	see that?
5	A Right, I do see that.
6	Q Now then the next page is the methodology,
7	verbal methodology and the following page is labeled
8	at the top sample, do you see that?
9	A I see it.
10	Q Now this page describes what was the
11	sample that was purposefully selected for doing the
12	survey and the last paragraph on that page describes
13	the selection of a random sample, do you see that?
14	A I do.
15	Q It says that there was a quota of half
16	female, half male respondents. Do you see that?
17	A I do.
18	Q Would that be consistent with your do
19	you have any information about the extent to which
20	males or females make cable subscription decisions?
21	A No, I don't.
22	Q The next part of that paragraph describes

1	how there was a restriction specifically on viewers
2	and nonviewers of TBS super station, do you see that?
3	A Yes, I see that.
4	Q And of the 1200, no more than 200 were to
5	be completed among nonviewers. Do you see that?
6	A I see it.
7	Q But how did they, how did this study
8	define a nonviewer of TBS super station?
9	A How did they define it?
10	Q Yes.
11	A Well, I haven't had the whole study and I
12	haven't seen the questionnaire.
13	Q It's in the last sentence.
14	A Well, the sentence itself says that no
15	more than 200 interviews were to be completed among
16	nonviewers. They use some screening process in their
17	interview to determine that.
18	Q Do you see the last sentence there that
19	says "viewers are defined as those who watch TBS
20	network"?
21	A Yes, I see that.
22	Q Once a month or more?

1	A Once a month or more.
2	Q Now, that's not a typical viewing measure
3	per se, is it?
4	A Well, it's one type, which sounds to me
5	like a monthly cume.
6	Q That's right and it's not a rating or a
7	share and doesn't reflect the measure of average
8	quarter hour audience on WTBS, correct?
9	A Apparently not. It must be just a simple
10	act of having seen say one quarter hour of viewing in
11	the course of a month.
12	Q That is
13	A Or one instance of viewing.
14	Q If you ever watch in the course of a
15	month.
16	A Yes.
17	Q Okay, now flipping further pages and I'm
18	going to get to my questions in a moment. We have
19	another table of contents and Roman numeral IV, market
20	profile service, total respondents and some other
21	pages and finally you get to a page that's labeled
22	roman numeral IV-1 in the upper right hand corner. It

1	says key to abbreviation for attributes. Do you see
2	that?
3	A It's Roman numeral IV-6 in the upper right
4	hand corner?
5	Q IV-3 is the beginning of that. There are
6	two different listings.
7	A I see. Okay, I'm with you.
8	Q Okay, and these are the actual
9	questionnaire wordings on the right hand side that
10	relate to the program attributes that you presented in
11	Exhibit 11?
12	A Right.
13	Q Now, looking back now at your Exhibit 11
14	which is also reproduced in this demonstrative 9,
15	these program attributes, the full text of which is in
16	the exhibit, were simply asked of each of these
17	respondents in terms of their preferences and what
18	they wanted from a television station or a cable
19	network, is that right?
20	A That's right.
21	Q The ranking that you show in Exhibit 11 is
22	weighted by how much unfavorable, how much favorable

1	each attribute collected, right?
2	A Well, I wouldn't use the term weighted,
3	but that's the way it's displayed and the average
4	score is shown.
5	Q Okay.
6	A Weighting has another meaning.
7	Q It's referred to as weighted up there at
8	the top of the page, but yes, that is
9	A That refers to the sample itself was
LO	weighted.
.1	Q Okay.
.2	A On other variables like demographics or
_3	something.
4	Q Okay. Now there wasn't a specific
.5	identification of PBS station attributes, correct?
.6	A No.
_7	Q The attributes are simply neutrally
.8	described and your testimony is that a number of them
.9	match up with public television programming in your
20	perspective?
21	A That's right, there's a lot of familiarity
22	and similarity.

1	Q Some of these also, however, match up with
2	commercial television programs as well, correct?
3	A When you look down the list, yes.
4	Q For example, programs that make you think
5	could apply to public affairs programs or
6	documentaries produced by commercial stations as well
7	as noncommercial stations?
8	A Well, that depends on the program. There
9	are a lot of them posing as documentaries that are, in
10	my opinion, very shallow, so it would depend on the
11	program.
12	Q It's not your testimony that there is no
13	program on commercial television that doesn't make you
14	think, is it?
15	A It's not.
16	JUDGE VON KANN: How many negatives in
17	that sentence?
18	(Laughter.)
19	BY MR. STEWART:
20	Q The Panel is presented with a couple of
21	examples of commercial television station produced
22	programs, one of which was a documentary about the

1	gold rush in Sacramento. You have no reason to
2	believe that that wouldn't be deemed a program that
3	makes you think, would you?
4	A Treatment is everything and I have seen
5	programs that ought to make you think make you go to
6	sleep, so I just can't answer that.
7	Q Well, you can't be too cynical. That
8	would apply to sometimes
9	A I take your point.
10	(Laughter.)
11	Q Yet the attribute would keep you informed
12	through newsbreaks could apply to newsbreaks on
13	commercial television stations?
14	A Yes, absolutely.
15	Q And there are some programs on commercial
16	television, locally produced programs for children
17	that are educational, correct?
18	A On commercial locally produced
19	Q Commercial television, local produced
20	programs for children that are educational?
21	A In recent decades, I can't recall seeing
22	any. There was a time when every station had a

1	children's program. I worked for one. And I just
2	haven't seen any in recent years. If there are any,
3	I've missed them. I'm not aware of them.
4	Q Late night news could apply to late night
5	news on commercial television stations?
6	A Oh sure.
7	Q Now and documentary programs, if it's a
8	documentary produced by a local television station,
9	local commercial television station, that could apply
10	as well?
11	A It could and there are some here and
12	there.
13	Q Okay, now if you go down the list to
14	attribute 57, I'm sorry, 56.
15	A Repeat seeing episode, is that what you're
16	looking at?
17	Q Right. Do you see that?
18	A I do.
19	Q And that didn't get such a high average
20	rating?
21	A That's right.
22	Q And if you look at the actual

1	questionnaire wording that repeats the same episode of
2	a show at several different times?
3	A Yes, well I think that's the individual
4	responding for himself. I don't think a person would
5	want to watch the same program twice unless it's
6	Seinfeld.
7	(Laughter.)
8	As I said earlier, I was referring to
9	household duplication, but proceed.
10	Q Okay, number 51, just above that it shows
11	a lot of sports, do you see that?
12	A Uh-huh.
13	Q And that actually got higher unfavorable
14	ratings than all but 10 or so of the program
15	categories?
16	A Yes, it did.
17	Q Seinfeld was on the network in 1998,
18	correct?
19	A Yes.
20	Q So it didn't count for these proceedings
21	in its network versions?
22	A I don't think so.

1	Q We'll find out. We're going to have more
2	questions rather than fewer, I'm sorry.
3	A I dug myself a hole.
4	Q Going back to NAB's exhibit demonstrative
5	number 9, if you page 4-12 is the
6	A That's that graph?
7	Q Is the graph that's part of your Exhibit
8	11. I want to flip further back in the document.
9	There's another section called factor analysis of
10	attributes and several pages back, page Roman numeral
11	IV-18, there's a report of the results of this
12	separate analysis, do you see that?
13	A I do.
14	Q And this was essentially taking a number
15	of the individual attributes and collecting them
16	together around specific concepts.
17	A That's the factor analysis process. It's
18	a statistical data reduction process to put attributes
19	into clusters based on the way respondents kind of see
20	them similarly or choose them in groups.
21	Q Okay, and I'm going to assume that you
22	feel comfortable saying first, in terms of these
J	i de la companya de

1	are ranked in descending order of average importance.
2	Do you feel comfortable saying that the first is
3	variety of programming, that reflects that's a PBS
4	attribute in your
5	A Yes, it is.
6	Q Might it also be an attribute of
7	individual commercial television stations?
8	A There certainly is variety on individual
9	commercial stations. We just feel that we have a
10	wider variety. That's why we make that statement.
11	Q The next concept is defendable quality and
12	that's something you've talked about before with
13	respect to public television?
14	A Yes.
15	Q The next concept in order by average
16	importance is news. Do you see that?
17	A I do.
18	Q And with respect to news, it is the case,
19	is it not, that commercial television stations provide
20	more newscasts, more news programming than public
21	television stations?
22	A That's true.

1	Q The Jim Lehrer Report is, in effect, the
2	network news program what's it called, the
3	Newshour?
4	A It's the Newshour with Jim Lehrer. It's
5	one hour Monday through Friday. And it's network,
6	national.
7	Q Okay.
8	A Some stations do local news, but they're
9	in the minority.
10	Q Now this whole study does not, is not a
11	measure of the amount of viewing done by these people
12	of various program types, is that right?
13	A I'm sorry, ask that again.
14	Q This whole PBS study is not a measure of
15	viewing, the amount of viewing done by people?
16	A No, it's not.
17	Q It instead asks for impressions or
18	preferences or the like?
19	A Yes, it's attitudes and preferences,
20	basically.
21	Q Do you think that that is an appropriate -
22	- do you think that that's relevant to the question of
	1

value of program, distant signal programs in the 1 2 commercial marketplace? I think it's extremely germane because 3 that's the kind of information that's going to cause 4 5 a person to subscribe to a cable system or not and that's what the cable operator ought to be depending 6 upon is whether he or she is providing these very 7 things that we see in this survey because that's what 8 9 people value. Would you turn, please to Exhibit 25 --10 Q 11 JUDGE GULIN: Tell you what, before we 12 leave this survey, let me ask you to take a look at 13 number 59 which is programs containing adult themes 14 and sex and number 63, programs containing violence. They rank so low that they're actually negative. Now 15 16 last time I watched television there's an awful lot of that stuff. What does that -- I mean I would assume 17 that the networks don't put this stuff on because they 18 think nobody wants it and nobody is watching. 19 20 does that tell you about this survey? THE WITNESS: I certainly don't think that 21 it devalues what we're seeing here. This is what 22

people tell you and in the case of something like 1 program adult themed sex, most people may feel that 2 way and apparently they do according to this survey, 3 but you just need so many to make a program valuable. 4 I'm trying not to sneeze. 5 You can take a break and JUDGE GULIN: 6 7 sneeze if you want to. 8 (Laughter.) I'll try not to. 9 THE WITNESS: And of 10 course, the people who -- the cable systems who offer adult program material for pay don't need very many to 11 12 make a lot of money, you know, so there's -- this 13 really isn't relevant in that case, I don't think, in a pay television. 14 Programs that contain violence, again that 15 16 depends on what you mean by violence. People say 17 this, but what you see on television is not that They tend to talk about it a lot, but they 18 violent. 19 don't show it that much. JUDGE GULIN: I quess maybe you're making 20 a little bit of my point is you give a survey like 21 22 this to people. Who's not going to say they want high

1	quality programs? By definition, that's going to be
2	almost predicts the result before you even ask the
3	question that whatever is high quality to a particular
4	person is what they're going to say they want to see.
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, yes.
6	JUDGE GULIN: I don't think there are too
7	many people, I know I wouldn't, if I got a call and I
8	was asked do you want more sex on TV? I'm not going
9	to say yes. So in some sense
10	JUDGE VON KANN: Well, if he does is that
11	the issue?
12	(Laughter.)
13	JUDGE GULIN: So I guess in that sense,
13	JUDGE GULIN: So I guess in that sense, isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to
14	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to
14 15	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to be quite expected. I'm not sure that
14 15 16	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to be quite expected. I'm not sure that THE WITNESS: Well, there are certain of
14 15 16 17	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to be quite expected. I'm not sure that THE WITNESS: Well, there are certain of these attributes and in any type of an attribute
14 15 16 17 18	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to be quite expected. I'm not sure that THE WITNESS: Well, there are certain of these attributes and in any type of an attribute survey, some that are easier for respondent to answer
14 15 16 17 18 19	isn't it kind of the point is that a lot of this is to be quite expected. I'm not sure that THE WITNESS: Well, there are certain of these attributes and in any type of an attribute survey, some that are easier for respondent to answer than others, that's true. And certainly people are

1	pie syndrome that some of these things are framed in
2	a way that people would be ashamed not to subscribe
3	to, but may or may not reflect their actual viewing
4	habits?
5	JUDGE GULIN: I guess to some people, high
6	quality programming could be watching the Cubs all day
7	long, right?
8	JUDGE VON KANN: A limited number, but
9	loyal.
10	JUDGE YOUNG: I want to pick that up from
11	where I thought Judge Gulin was going. I was watching
12	TV last night and I could name you two or three
13	programs I watched where there was a lot of shooting.
14	One program, NYPD Blue, there was a sexual scene at
15	the end. So obviously, somebody is making a judgment
16	that we want to watch that.
17	THE WITNESS: Yes.
18	JUDGE YOUNG: I want to pursue that
19	because that seems an interesting point. Does that
20	mean that nobody really listens to this these kinds
21	of surveys?
22	THE WITNESS: No, no. It's these

1	particularly you all have singled out some subject
2	areas that are what researchers call loaded. They
3	have another dimension to them like you don't want to
4	admit to the interviewer that you do like sex or you
5	don't want quality or whatever. That's a phenomenon
6	that all researchers have to deal with and take into
7	account. And I truly don't believe that that renders
8	the whole survey worthless if that's the question.
9	It's just that there are certain items that do have
10	those effect aspects to them.
11	Yes, there is some sex portrayed in prime
12	time television. It's talked about a lot on NBC's
13	Friends, for example. And yes, NYPD Blues will
14	sometimes slip in a cheek or something.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: Actually, last night it was
16	more.
17	THE WITNESS: It was more. Okay. So
18	that's is that a sufficient answer?
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Well, let me just take one
20	more step. This is not reflective of the anecdotal
21	experience I had, but I do have a sense that some of
22	these reality TV programs and there's a lot more sex

than you're giving credit to. 1 THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not sure what else 2 I would say other than what I've said already is that 3 the way people answer in a survey on certain loaded 4 items that are sensitive could be different from their 5 actual behavior. 6 7 JUDGE YOUNG: What's also interesting about this is looking at Demo. 9 and looking to that 8 9 Roman IV-4 or Roman IV-3 that Mr. Stewart had directed us to, the descriptions of program adult theme/sex on 10 11 Roman IV-4 seems to be taking pains to not to sort of 12 hint that we're talking about hard core. It seems to Similarly, programming 13 be talking a little softer. 14 containing violence seemed to be a little softer. THE WITNESS: I understand. And my answer 15 I think some people may just not feel 16 17 comfortable admitting to that during a telephone 18 survey. I will also point out on JUDGE YOUNG: 19 20 Masterpiece Theater on Sunday night, PTB had the -there were two or three sexual situations on that show 21

as well.

2.2

1	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry I missed it.
2	(Laughter.)
3	THE WITNESS: I understand what you're
4	saying, thank you.
5	BY MR. STEWART:
6	Q Mr. Fuller, just following up on this a
7	bit, is there a difference in your view between the
8	economic incentive in the marketplace and commercial
9	network mass market programming on the one hand and on
10	the other hand cable operators who sell packages of
11	channels to subscribers?
12	A I'm not sure I understand. Could you ask
13	it another way?
14	Q Is the amount of viewing done to programs
15	with sex or violence in them on national commercial
16	television networks relevant from an economic
17	perspective to the national networks?
18	A Well, never having worked at one of the
19	national networks, I don't know. I don't know whether
20	they had proof that it does matter. They apparently
21	think it does because they include it in some
22	programs.

1	Q Well, to the extent that whatever series
2	of program attributes on the commercial network of
3	programs attracts large audiences, that's potentially
4	the source of large advertising revenue for the
5	commercial networks, correct?
6	A If it has a large audience, if that's what
7	you're saying. However, they manage to get it, yes.
8	Q The cable operator does the cable
9	operator get additional revenue if an audience to a
10	program involving sex or violence turns out to be very
11	large?
12	A No, no, it's not related.
13	JUDGE GULIN: On the other hand, some of
14	the most expensive and valuable programming on cable
15	would be HBO, Showtime which has the most sex and
16	violence, correct?
17	THE WITNESS: That's what I've heard. I
18	haven't seen. I don't subscribe, so I'll have to take
19	your word for it. I've heard that.
20	BY MR. STEWART:
21	Q Turning to Exhibit 25 attached to your
22	testimony. Wold you explain to me first what the

1	the 1.9 for PBS means there?
2	A That's a household rating calculated in
3	prime time during the 1998-1999 PBS television season.
4	So it means 1.9 percent of all U.S. TV households were
5	watching PBS during that period in that day part.
6	Q Now in looking at the 0.7 for cable
7	network news, CNN, what does that mean?
8	A That's calculated the same way. The 0.7
9	percent of all TV households were watching.
10	Q So you took the viewing to CNN which was
11	only in cable households and divided it by the total
12	number of television households, whether or not they
13	had cable?
14	A Yes. That's the way we compare ourselves
15	to all competitors just to put them on equal footing.
16	Q Okay, now if you were to adjust that for
17	the fact that CNN is not available to the non-cable
18	households among all U.S. TV households, you would
19	have a higher
20	A it would go up a little.
21	Q In fact, there are roughly 100 million,
22	there were in 1999, 1998-1999, roughly 100 million

1	television households in the United States?
2	A That's about right.
3	Q Do you know how many cable households CNN
4	was in?
5	A I don't know precisely. I would assume it
6	was around cable households would probably be 65
7	million.
8	Q Let me show you actually
9	A Kagan?
10	Q Which is <u>Kagan Economics Basic Cable</u>
11	Networks 2003. Are you familiar with this?
12	A I'm familiar with the company, I don't
13	have that book.
14	Q I'll just show you the first table that's
15	labeled "Cable Network TV Household Penetration."
16	Down at the bottom they have total
17	multichannel households and below that U.S. TV
18	A Households.
19	Q Oh no, that's not the number that I was
20	looking for.
21	(Pause.)
22	Here we go. This is the page here. It

1	shows U.S. TV households in millions for the various
2	years covered by this report and its 99 and some for
3	1998 and 100.8 for 1999.
4	A So for the two it's about 100.
5	Q About 100. And then I'm going to turn to
6	the we have it right here. There's CNN and that
7	shows you the number in millions of cable households
8	receiving CNN in 1998 and 1999 and what are those
9	numbers?
10	A Well, just a moment, let's be clear
11	because I'm not sure that this is cable penetration.
12	I see Kagan is using the term multichannel which would
13	include DBS, could it not?
14	Q Okay.
15	A Let me find it. So whatever this
16	statistic is, Kagan is not great about labeling
17	things. I see about 76 to 77.
18	Q Okay, million.
19	A Million.
20	Q PBS is available essentially to all
21	A Ninety-nine percent.
22	Q Of television households in the U.S.,

1	cable and non-cable?
2	A Yes, all TV households.
3	Q So the 1.9 prime time average audience
4	rating is 1.9 percent of all those 100 million
5	households?
6	A That's right.
7	Q So if you wanted to just adjust the 0.7 to
8	make it comparable, in effect, within the universe to
9	which CNN is available which is not 100 million
10	households, it's more like 75 million households, you
11	can just do an arithmetic computation to get a number
12	that's comparable, is that right?
13	A Well, it depends on point. We calculate
14	them this way because we think this is fair because it
15	represents truly the 7/10ths of one percent of all
16	households.
17	You know what it means without knowing
18	anything about the penetration of the cable network
19	which is irrelevant to us. But if you wanted to make
20	the adjustment you describe, yes, it would go up what,
21	maybe 25 percent. So it might be closer to 1.0 if you
22	did that adjustment.

1	Q Okay, and just one other clarifying point.
2	In your Exhibit 16, in the far right hand column there
3	you've got total cable subscribers?
4	A Yes.
5	Q That's total form 3 cable subscribers?
6	A That's correct.
7	Q The total number of cable subscribers has
8	got to be more in this period, more than 75 million or
9	so which is how many households, cable households CNN
10	is in, or do you know the answer to that?
11	A You mean the actual number of cable
12	households during this period?
13	Q Right, it's more than 60 million, isn't
14	it?
15	A It would be a little more than that, yes,
16	probably closer, if I'm remembering correct, it's
17	probably closer to 68 million.
18	Q I have no further questions, thank you.
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Let me pursue one point when
20	Mr. Stewart was talking. He asked you about your
21	statistic that 28 percent of all TV households have
22	children under 12?

THE WITNESS: I remember. 1 you know if that 2 JUDGE YOUNG: Do statistic has changed over time so that in 1990-92, a 3 higher percentage of TV households had children under 4 12? 5 THE WITNESS: That's -- you're talking 6 about the change in the population over time. 7 JUDGE YOUNG: Right. 8 And I don't recall whether 9 THE WITNESS: 10 the proportion has changed. I know it hasn't changed much because it's a very long slow trend over decades 11 12 and there was a time when the birth rate had gone down 13 like in the early 1980s, I think it was much lower and we began over time, we began to see the persons per 14 household ratio going down and then in recent years 15 16 it's reversed a little bit. That's as much as I can 17 remember, really about the trends in the population where people been having more children during the 18 19 last, I think, 5 to 10 years, but I don't recall whether that particular percent has changed very much. 20 What you just said about 21 JUDGE YOUNG:

possibly a phenomenon of people having more children

22

1	probably is not relevant to this particular statistic
2	because whether a particular household that has
3	children under 12 has more may be relevant. I'm sort
4	of thinking of the fact that we talked about yesterday
5	that the baby boom generation is getting older and if
6	the baby boom generation was a spike in population
7	post war into the 1950s, and if that group is getting
8	older, presumably that group, their kids are now over
9	12.
10	THE WITNESS: It gets complicated because
11	the population trends, they have these funny cycles
12	and after the baby boomers, there was a boomlet they
13	call it where there was things, the number of new
14	births I think went down and then it began to come
15	back up again. But I just can't work this through
16	with you very easily right here without some
17	population data.
18	I think it's all fairly minor as far as
19	these percentages are concerned.
20	JUDGE YOUNG: You mean the variations over
21	time?
22	THE WITNESS: The variations over time.

They're really over a long period of time. Not huge
variations in any event.
There might be to demographers and to
people who sell to those groups, you know in terms of
absolute terms, but not as a percent.
MR. STEWART: You may now understand the
strategic purpose of that thing on the videotape that
said PBS gives you a better sex life.
THE WITNESS: We alone are responsible for
the boomlet.
(Laughter.)
MR. TUCCI: Your Honor, it's going to take
us about five minutes to move all of our stuff up
there. I know it's a little bit early for the break,
but in the interest of efficiency, you may want to
consider doing that now.
JUDGE VON KANN: All right. Why don't we
come back at whatever it looks like about a couple
minutes before 12 and then let you have an hour and
let us all have an hour.
(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:44

1	a.m. and resumed at 12:00 a.m.)
2	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. Mr. Tucci.
3	MR. TUCCI: I'm ready. I'm ready.
4	CROSS EXAMINATION
5	BY MR. TUCCI:
6	Q Mr. Fuller, my name is Michael Tucci, and
7	I represent the Program Supplier category in these
8	proceedings. I apologize at the outset because I
9	guarantee you I'm going to call you Mr. Wilson at some
10	point during the day, and don't take it as an offense.
11	A That's all right.
12	Q Because it's fresh in our mind, I think
13	I'll start with the Sieber testimony. Mr. Sieber
14	worked for WTBS. Is that correct?
15	A That's right.
16	Q Okay. And he presented testimony in the
17	1990-1992 proceeding surrounding this survey that
18	we've been discussing. Right?
19	A Yes, that's my understanding.
20	Q Okay. Now we've designated Mr. Sieber's
21	testimony as part of this record, but just for the
22	sake of completeness in our discussion today, we're

1	handing out PS Demo Exhibit number - I think it's 7.
2	It's 6. PS Demo 6. Okay.
3	MR. TUCCI: We'll identify it for the
4	record. It's the conclusion of Mr. Sieber from the
5	1990-92 testimony that he provided in these
6	proceedings.
7	(Whereupon, the above-referred
8	to document was marked as PS
9	Demo 6 for identification.)
10	BY MR. TUCCI:
11	Q Have you seen this before?
12	A No.
13	Q Okay. Mr. Sieber concluded, did he not,
14	"It is not coincidence that Turner Broadcasting became
15	a leader in the development of cable television
16	audience research, as WTBS becomes TBS Superstation.
17	Audience research was the foundation on which
18	programming decisions were made. Those decisions were
19	made to attract and keep subscribers interested in
20	receiving TBS. Our success in making those decisions
21	is shown by the widespread carriage of TBS and the
22	relatively high ratings that TBS continues to enjoy."

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

22

The next two paragraphs are sort of the essence of his conclusion, I believe. "Television ratings tell us to what extent and how subscribers use our program. Viewing is, after all, the end-use of link our product. Ratings supply the programmer and subscriber, the end-user of product. While attitudinal studies tell us about the why of subscriber behavior, ratings tell us what that Many new cable channels have been behavior is. offered based on stated subscriber preferences and failed. Those that have lasted and succeeded are those that receive the largest ratings. My testimony relies on the same research tools that I developed for TBS Superstation, and that were used in 1990 to make programming purchasing and scheduling decisions. The research underscores the value of syndicated programming to subscribers all around the country based not only on stated preferences, the why of their behavior, but also on the ratings that confirm that those preferences were translated into viewing syndicated activity. Вy all those measures, programming and away the most is far

1	programming available to TBS and other cable
2	programmers in building their subscriber-base and
3	keeping it."
4	Now this is the conclusion he reached,
5	notwithstanding the survey that you were talking about
6	this morning. Right?
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q Did you know
9	JUDGE von KANN: Is that a yes?
10	THE WITNESS: That's a yes.
11	BY MR. TUCCI:
12	Q Okay. Do you know whether prior to the
13	survey, let's say, what the predominant program
14	category that existed on TBS was?
15	A No, I don't.
16	Q Okay. Would it surprise you to learn that
17	it was syndicated programs and movies?
18	A No.
19	Q Okay. Do you know whether TBS changed any
20	of its programming line-up to any significant degree
21	as a result of the subscriber study that you testified
22	about?

1	A I don't know. No idea.
2	Q Do you know that TBS is now no longer
3	WTBS, the distant signal, but is TBS, a cable network?
4	A Yes, I've heard this.
5	Q Okay. Do you know whether TBS generates
6	more income as a cable network versus a distant
7	signal?
8	A I don't know that.
9	Q If we look to its revenues or its behavior
10	in the marketplace, we could determine whether the
11	marketplace accepts programming, if you will, or what
12	the marketplace value of that programming is, couldn't
13	we?
14	A I'm sorry. Say that one more time.
15	Q Okay. If we look at TBS revenues, we
16	could look to TBS revenues to determine whether or not
17	it's a successful organization, couldn't we?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Now have you ever worked for a cable
20	company?
21	A No.
22	Q Okay. So I guess you have no personal

1	you never bought syndicated programming I guess on
2	behalf of a cable company since you've never worked
3	for one.
4	A Not on behalf of a cable company, I have
5	for a station.
6	Q Okay. And that was 25 years ago, is that?
7	A Yeah, about.
8	Q Okay. I think your testimony states that
9	your job is to interpret audience data and trends. Is
10	that right?
11	A That's part of it, yes.
12	Q Okay. How big is the research department
13	at PBS?
14	A Eight people.
15	Q Okay. Has it grown over the years?
16	A A little. It was seven people when I came
17	to PBS, and it's eight now. That's it.
18	Q Do you generate any
19	JUDGE von KANN: Are you done with the
20	Sieber business?
21	MR. TUCCI: Yes.
22	JUDGE von KANN: Let me ask a follow-up,

1	if I can, while it's fresh. I'm a little confused
2	now, and maybe you can help me, Mr. Fuller. I don't
3	know whether you've had occasion in preparing for this
4	testimony to go back and review Mr. Sieber's full
5	testimony and report from a prior proceeding. Have
6	you had that opportunity?
7	THE WITNESS: No, I haven't. I've just
8	read a few pages.
9	JUDGE von KANN: I guess the thing that
10	I'm a little confused about, if you know the answer,
11	fine. If not, someone else will probably tell us as
12	we go along. The conclusion that you were just shown
13	in PS Demo 6, as I read it, it sort of tends to say
14	attitudinal studies are fine, but the proof is in the
15	pudding. Let's really look at the ratings and see what
16	people are doing. Is that the way you sort of read
17	this conclusion?
18	THE WITNESS: That's the way this is
19	written, yes.
20	JUDGE von KANN: And, of course, the study
21	that you've been pointing to is, or the survey is, as
22	I understand it, an attitudinal survey, an interview

1	survey.
2	THE WITNESS: It is.
3	JUDGE von KANN: Now is there other
4	material in this report? I just skimmed it, and I
5	didn't see much in the way of rating results, but
6	maybe I missed it. So I'm having a little disconnect
7	between the conclusion that says you shouldn't get
8	overly influenced by interview studies, and then a
9	report that seems to be grounded on an interview
LO	study.
L1	THE WITNESS: That surprised me, as well.
L2	I can't figure out why that was brought in.
L3	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
L4	MR. TUCCI: The entire testimony again,
L5	the entire testimony has been designated for the
L6	record. And there are some discussions in there about
7	ratings, and you have to understand, as well, that it
.8	was presented in conjunction with the Program
.9	Suppliers case which contains much more information
20	about ratings at that time.
21	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
22	MR. HESTER: Could I ask you for a

1	clarification. In this conclusion, this PS Demo 6,
2	this is the conclusion from Mr. Sieber's written
3	testimony?
4	MR. TUCCI: Correct.
5	MR. HESTER: So it's not the conclusion to
6	the study.
7	MR. TUCCI: It's the conclusion to the
8	written testimony that included the study as part of
9	it.
10	JUDGE von KANN: I guess what we've got,
11	and I'm just guessing here, is we've got Sieber giving
12	testimony, probably part of maybe an exhibit to
13	that testimony was this survey and maybe other things
14	or other exhibits. And then this is his overarching
15	conclusion. Okay.
16	MR. TUCCI: And again, I think this is one
17	thing that has been designated in its entirety by
18	several Claimant Groups to be honest with you.
19	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. All right. Thank
20	you.
21	MR. TUCCI: Uh-huh.
22	BY MR. TUCCI:

1	Q We were talking about your department in
2	PBS. Are there any regular reports that are generated
3	by your department?
4	A Yes. We produce a number of audience
5	reports.
6	Q What are they called?
7	A Well, there are different ones. We do a
8	daily overnight report based on the local market
9	overnight ratings. We do lots of audience analysis.
10	We do a national audience report on a quarterly basis
11	based on national Nielsen ratings. We do an annual
12	cable audience report based on cable ratings, compared
13	with PBS and so forth. I mean, those are some. Plus
14	we do custom reports, as requested.
15	Q Okay. And who do you send these reports
16	to?
17	A To the stations, to our producers, to our
18	management, just about anybody who requests them on a
19	per inquiry basis.
20	Q I see. Is there a regular distribution of
21	these reports? Like say the overnights, for example?
22	A Yes, there is. It's an internal list.

1	Q And is there a and what's the next
2	regular report that's generated by your department?
3	Is there a weekly report, or a monthly report?
4	A There are monthly reports. I write a
5	monthly report, which is internal.
6	Q So there's more than one monthly report.
7	Is that
8	A Actually, there are some other monthly
9	reports. We generate a monthly report on children's
10	ratings. There's a monthly report that these are
11	just simple e-mail reports that summarize what our
12	prime time rating has done. Actually, that's a
13	quarterly. I take that back. But the one I write for
14	management is a monthly report.
15	Q Do you include in these reports I think
16	you've already stated that you include ratings
17	information. Right?
18	A Sure.
19	Q Okay. Do you include any demographic
20	information in these reports?
21	A Many of them, yes.
22	Q Okay. What kind of demographic

1	information is included, just in general?
2	A It's very comprehensive. We look at all
3	the variables that Nielsen provides.
4	Q Do you look at ratings by demographics?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Do you use Nielsen demographics as do
7	you use the same demographic categories as Nielsen
8	does?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Do you provide any of these reports to
11	underwriters?
12	A Yes, we do.
13	Q Okay. Is that on a regular basis?
14	A It's on an as-needed basis.
15	Q Are you asked on occasion to provide
16	reports in conjunction with staff efforts to secure
17	underwriting?
18	A Yes. We regularly do that.
19	Q Is that like once a day?
20	A No. No. It's a regular means. In the
21	course of a month, maybe two to four times, perhaps.
22	Q And are you asked to I take it from

1	your testimony that you're asked to provide that in an
2	effort to secure underwriting. Is that right?
3	A That's correct, yes.
4	Q And do you do follow-ups with particular
5	underwriters to see how audiences are responding to
6	particular programs?
7	A Sometimes. Some want to know that, and
8	some do not.
9	Q Now turning to some of the specifics in
10	your testimony, we talked about this a little bit this
11	morning, but I'm going to make sure that I'm clear
12	because I'm not the brightest bulb in the room. We
13	had if we look at your Exhibit 16, I think is what
14	it is.
15	A Uh-huh.
16	Q We can tell the number of subscriber
17	instances for particular years - right - or total
18	cable subscribers if we look in the right-hand column.
19	Right?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Okay. And
22	A Form 3.

1	Q Form 3. Right. And we can figure out how
2	many PTV subscribers there are if we add up these
3	columns. Right? The first one, second and third.
4	A With a distant signal.
5	Q With a distant signal.
6	A Yes.
7	Q Thanks. And if we look just take the
8	one in the middle. We've got 98-2, the reporting
9	period. And I added those up, and I think I did it
10	correctly and it came out to 5,939,000 roughly.
11	A What were you adding?
12	Q The three columns for 98-2, subscribe
13	whose first signal is
14	A Adding across.
15	Q Adding across. That's right.
16	A Okay.
17	Q I'm sorry. And we have 58,495,000 in 98-2
18	total subscribers.
19	A Yeah.
20	Q So my addition of 5.9 million is roughly
21	10 percent, a little bit over 10 percent.
22	A That's what we got too.

1	Q Okay. And the bullets on page 2 of your
2	testimony, I think that you break them down into two
3	categories. One of the first bullet is the
4	households that did not have access to local. Correct?
5	That's 3.6 percent. Their first signal was a
6	A Yeah. The first signal was a distant
7	signal.
8	Q Okay.
9	A Yes. There are
10	Q How many I'm sorry.
11	A No, go ahead. I was just clarifying that
12	the only Public Television signal they get is a
L3	distant public signal.
L4	Q And are there occasions where there are
L5	cable systems that have no PTV signal on them, either
L6	local or distant?
L7	A Yeah, there's a small like 2 percent of
L8	them.
L9	Q Okay. And we have about 2,500 cable
20	systems. Is that right?
21	A I think that's right, yes.
22	Q So doing the math, it's roughly 50?

1	A If you say so. I can't do that in my
2	head. It's 2 percent of the total, whatever the total
3	is, 2,500. So yes, that would be about 50.
4	Q Okay. And the second bullet there is the
5	category of PTV that is carried in addition to local.
6	Correct? 6.7.
7	A That's right.
8	Q All right. And that's where we get the 10
9	percent because we can add the 3.6 and the 6.7, it
10	comes up to 10.3.
11	A That's right.
12	Q Okay. In the second bullet there, we've
L3	got a 6.7 percent of, you said U.S. cable households
L4	that get PTV on a distant basis, and have no other
15	access to PTV. And I take that to mean that there's
L6	the corollary to that is that there are 94 percent
L7	of U.S. cable households that have decided that either
L8	no PTV or local PTV is good enough. Is that right?
L9	A Was it 94 or
30	Q Well, it's 100 minus 6.7. Right?
21	A Oh, I see what you're saying. Yes, 93
22	percent.
	1

1	Q	All right. And if we look at the universe
2	in the aggre	egate, we have 23 percent that carry, which
3	I think is	
4	A	Of the systems.
5	Q	Of the systems, right.
6	A	Right.
7	Q	That carry PTV, which I think is your
8	Exhibit 15	
9	A	That's right.
10	Q	And they represent these 10 percent.
11	Ä	Of subscribers, yes.
12	Q	Okay. So the reverse of that then is, we
13	have 77 perc	cent of systems representing 90 percent of
14	subscribers	that don't take PTV on a distant basis.
15	Right?	
16	A	Yeah, that's correct.
17	Q	Okay. Now if it's 77 percent representing
18	90 percent,	if we do the math, we can figure out that
19	those system	ns are actually the larger systems. Right?
20	A	That's right. Yes.
21	Q	On average.
22	A	Sure.

1	Q All right. And would you agree are you
2	an economist by the way?
3	A No.
4	Q Would you agree with the notion that we
5	can look at what cable operators do, and that's
6	evidence of behavior within the cable market, can't
7	we?
8	A That would be yeah, that would be helpful.
9	Q Okay. On page 9 and 10 of your testimony,
10	you talk about the Annenberg Survey. Do you remember
11	that?
12	A Yes.
13	MR. TUCCI: Okay. Let me go ahead and
14	mark for the record PS Exhibit number 26-X. Let me
15	hand you a copy and hand the panel four copies.
16	(Whereupon, the above-referred
17	to document was marked as PS
18	26-X for identification.)
19	BY MR. TUCCI:
20	Q Take a minute to look at that. I believe
21	on the bottom of page 9 in your footnote 4, you
22	identify it as "Media in the home - 1999 - Annenberg
I	

1	Public Policy Center, University of Pennsylvania." Is
2	this the same survey?
3	A Seems to be, yes.
4	Q Okay. I want to direct your attention to
5	page 14 of the survey.
6	JUDGE von KANN: What page?
7	MR. TUCCI: Page 14 of the survey, which
8	is identified as PTV 000179. There's a couple of
9	graphs in the middle of that page.
10	BY MR. TUCCI:
11	Q Are you at the page with me, Mr. Fuller?
12	A I am.
13	Q Okay. We have figure 2.3 in the middle of
14	the page that says, "Where parents believe best
15	programs for young people can be found." And this is
16	for the period 1996 to 1999. And we've got graphs on
17	the board here which you might be able to look at and
18	see a little better than what we have on the page.
19	But if I'm reading this correctly, and tell me if I'm
20	not, that the area in the middle is for Public
21	Broadcasting. Right?
22	A That's right.

1	Q Okay. And we have percentages expressed
2	for the years 1996, '97, '98, and '99 right there in
3	the middle. Right?
4	A That's right.
5	Q Okay. And then the part on the left is
6	broadcast and the part on the right is cable.
7	A Uh-huh.
8	Q All right.
9	JUDGE von KANN: Is that a yes?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	BY MR. TUCCI:
12	Q Okay. Now in figure 2.3, "Where parents
13	believes best programs for young people can be found",
14	Public Broadcasting scored 50 in '96, 61 percent in
15	'97, 48 percent in 1998, and 44 percent in 1999.
16	Right?
17	A I see it. Yes.
18	Q Okay. And it goes down from 1997 to 1999
19	by about almost what, 18 percent. Right?
20	Ä Right.
21	Q Okay. And then if we look at the column
22	on the right, the table goes up from I think it's 29

1	to 31, to 37, to 38 for those four years. Do you see
2	that?
3	A I see that.
4	Q Okay. And if we look specifically at
5	1999, and add the broadcast and cable categories
6	together, we would get a number that is higher than
7	the Public Broadcasting number for "Where parents
8	believe best programs for young people can be found."
9	Is that right?
10	A That's kind of funky, but that's one way
11	to do it, I suppose.
12	Q Well, we'd just add I'm sorry.
13	A It's adding, you know, all of these
14	classes together when we're a single class. You know,
15	it speaks for those whole industries. So yes, if you
16	take my point.
17	Q I take your point. That's fine.
18	A Okay.
19	Q And the figure below it, figure 2.4,
20	"Where 10 to 17 year olds believe the best programs
21	can be found."
22	A Uh-huh.

1	Q The percentages are substantially higher
2	for broadcast and cable on the left and on the right
3	than they are for Public Broadcasting. Right?
4	A Yes, I see that, and I understand that
5	because we had not been directing a lot of our
6	programming effort toward teenagers.
7	Q And in fact I'm sorry.
8	A Or pre-teens.
9	Q And, in fact, a lot of the programming
10	that you talk bout in your testimony is really for
11	little kids. Is that right?
12	A It's the under 12 group mostly.
13	Q Which part of them would be included in
14	these category right, the 10 to 17?
15	A A couple of years, but our emphasis has
16	been on children 2 to 5, and 6 to 11, and in
17	particular and the 6 to 11 is a more recent
18	phenomenon. In particular, 6 to 9.
L9	Q All right. And what programs are directed
20	at the 6 to 9? Is that "Arthur"?
21	A "Arthur" is one. That's a very popular
22	show. I think "Dragon Tales", to some extent.

JUDGE von KANN: Let me ask you a question about this graph here. I, obviously, haven't had a chance to read this study, and so maybe it gets answered in here somewhere. And maybe you recall, Mr. Fuller, maybe you don't. Looking at these figures, what I find a little confusing is separating broadcast different public broadcasting and cable into categories when you can get public broadcasting on You can get broadcast stations on cable, so cable. it's not clear to me whether this is talking about the people who looked at public broadcasting over the air, but some of the people that answered about cable may be thinking well, you know, I turn on my cable system, and they watch some public broadcasting stations. They watch -- do you understand how this survey was set up to sort of separate the overlap problem that I just mentioned?

THE WITNESS: Yeah. I know the problem you're talking about, and I don't have a copy of the questionnaire to see how they did it. The question is about the language that was used in the interview, you know. How do you characterize cable?

21

22

1	I've seen other studies that have used
2	language similar to this, not from this study but
3	others, and they including the Roper Organization,
4	which uses cable in fact, they use cable, public
5	television, and regular television, I think. And
6	somehow, people seem to be able to make distinctions,
7	because you see clear differences between the answers.
8	JUDGE von KANN: When you told us, for
9	example, I think that 99 percent of cable systems have
10	PBS on there.
11	THE WITNESS: Yeah, that's right.
12	JUDGE von KANN: So when you talk about
13	cable, you're sweeping in I mean
14	THE WITNESS: I know. It's a fair
15	question, and I don't know the precise answer to it.
16	We have not seen anything in our surveys that made us
17	terribly suspicious of that. People do seem to be
18	able to identify the three different categories. But
19	there may be some blurring in here.
20	JUDGE von KANN: All right.
21	MR. TUCCI: I don't have anything further
22	on this. Your Honor, I'd ask that PS Exhibit 26-X be

1	reached for impeachment purposes.
2	THE WITNESS: The key thing to keep in
	mind about this is that public broadcasting as a
4	single broadcaster is still well above the individual
5	categories. Now if you do add them together, that's
6	a different thing, but I don't know what to make of
7	that.
8	JUDGE von KANN: All right. Mr. Hester,
9	any objection?
10	MR. HESTER: No objection.
11	MR. TUCCI: Actually, I was just reminded
12	that it's actually their document that was produced,
13	and perhaps it would be more appropriate that it be
14	received for substantive purposes, which I assume you
15	have no objection to.
16	MR. HESTER: I don't have an objection to
17	that. It's a document underlying Mr. Fuller's
18	testimony, and he cited.
19	JUDGE von KANN: All right. We'll receive
20	it generally.
21	(Whereupon, the document
22	previously marked as PS 26-X
1	· ·

1	for identification was received
2	into evidence.)
3	BY MR. TUCCI:
4	Q Mr. Fuller, are you familiar with the term
5	"branding"?
6	A Yes.
7	Q What does it mean?
8	A It refers to the efforts of a well, it
9	could be a product manufacturer, or it could be in our
10	case a television company, strengthening their
11	identity among their customers, so that if, you know,
12	you have a particular name or identity that you're
13	trying to impress upon people and have them become
14	familiar with, and like, and remember, you will do
15	make efforts in your branding efforts to try to
16	strengthen that in people's minds.
17	Q Is that like tying things together? Is
18	that a fair way to look at it?
19	A Well, I'm not sure I know what you mean by
20	tying things together. It's the attitudes people have
21	toward your brand. Basically, the awareness and the
22	attitudes constitute perceptions of a brand.

1	Q How does PBS does PBS engage in efforts
2	to try and brand itself?
3	A Oh, yes.
4	Q Okay. And how does it do that?
5	A Well, advertising is one way. Another is
6	to use your logo, use our logo as often as possible,
7	either in printed materials or on the air, trying to
8	encourage the stations to use the PBS logo in their
9	own productions. You know, if they produce a
LO	promotional announcement to go on the air, that they
11	include the PBS logo. So all of these things build
L2	awareness of the logo, as well. And as far as the
L3	attitude toward it, we think that the programming
L4	helps with that, because we have good programming.
L5	They associate good programming with our brand because
L6	we put the brand, branding the logo on the
L7	programming. We also have promotional announcements
L8	that we have created to be run on the stations that
L9	reinforce the meaning of the brand. Like the Be More
20	Campaign which is currently running, Be More Informed,
21	Be More Enlightened, that sort of thing.
22	Q Are there situations where your

1	underwriters try to use branding to brand themselves
2	to PBS programs, to your knowledge?
3	A Well, I'm not sure if that's branding, but
4	I would think an underwriter, and all underwriters get
5	a credit announcement at the start and the end of a
6	program - would want to be recognized for their
7	sponsorship of that program. So the very act of
8	broadcasting to an audience should help boost their
9	awareness and association with the sponsorship
10	program.
11	Q And in the promotional material that PBS
12	produces, is the sponsor given credit in that
13	promotional material often?
14	A On air?
15	Q No, not on air.
16	A Printed?
17	Q Right. I mean, on the air they get the 15
18	or 30 second spot
19	A They get their right.
20	Q that we were talking about before.
21	Right?
22	A I thought you meant in a promotional

1	announcement.
2	Q No, like a magazine advertisement.
3	A Yeah.
4	Q Or a newspaper advertisement.
5	A Over the years, I think there have been
6	some instances where we may have done that. I don't
7	know that we do that on a regular basis. I don't see
8	all of the print ads that our company produces, so I
9	just don't know for sure.
10	Q And Mr. Wilson and I talked a little bit
11	yesterday about underwriting in general, but maybe
12	we'll get into it in a little bit more detail here.
13	To your knowledge, is it often the case that
14	underwriters will pick specific PBS programs because
15	they're in a particular area that they're interested
16	in?
17	A What kind of area?
18	Q Well, say like cooking shows.
19	A You mean content area.
20	Q Yes. Exactly. Exactly. I didn't mean
21	geographic area.
22	A Yeah, that's what confused me.

1	Q I meant the content.
2	A Sure. They, for whatever reason that
3	works for them, yes, they will they may choose a
4	program for that reason. Yes.
5	Q And we have situations where like a
6	cooking show might be underwritten by a cookware
7	maker?
8	A Yes, that's true. I was just trying to
9	think where we have regulations against that. and I
10	believe it's in Public Affairs programs. For example,
11	an investigative documentary where you could not have
12	some company that stands to gain from the subject of
13	this investigative documentary as the underwriter. So
14	in that case, they're prohibited.
15	Q I assume kid's shows could be underwritten
L6	by products that appeal to kids.
L7	A That's right.
L8	Q Underwritten by companies that sell
19	products that
20	A That's right.
21	Q appeal to kids.
22	A Yes.

1	Q And one specific example that I saw is in
2	1998, I think "The Discovery Zone", are you familiar
3	with that company - underwrote certain PBS programs.
4	A Yes. I've heard of that.
5	Q And Discovery Zone was an indoor
6	children's playground. Right?
7	A That's my recollection.
8	Q Which unfortunately has gone the way of
9	Chapter XI in bankruptcy proceedings.
10	A That's what I've heard, yes.
11	Q Do you know how much PBS received from the
12	Discovery Zone?
13	A No, I have no idea.
14	Q Let's look at a document that we'll mark
15	as PS Exhibit 27-X.
16	(Whereupon, the above-referred
17	to document was marked as PS
18	27-X for identification.)
19	MR. TUCCI: We'll identify it for the
20	record as a October 7th, 1998 article in the Hollywood
21	Reporter, and the byline of Paula Bernstein entitled,
22	"Nader gives Sesame the bird - changes include

1	sponsorship as kid's show turns 30 this year."
2	A Yeah. I see Ralph Nader was protesting
3	the show's decision to accept corporate sponsorship.
4	Q That's right. Now in 1998, was there a
5	change in policy at PBS regarding sponsorship? Did it
6	become something that was more actively sought in this
7	era, the 1998-99 era than had been previously?
8	A I don't recall.
9	Q Well, this article talks about a new
LO	contract, I think, for is it "The Children's
L1	Television Workshop"? Is that the producer of "Sesame
L2	Street"?
L3	A That's right.
L4	Q Okay. And this is specifically referring
L5	to "The Discovery Zone" deal that we were talking
L6	about a little bit ago. Right?
7	A Yes. It doesn't say why he objected to
-8	it. It just says that he thought it was "exploiting
.9	impressionable children", when all we broadcast is
20	just a credit. You know, we don't show products, we
21	don't show things in use, so I don't know what, you
22	know, burr was up his behind for that.

1	Q Did this criticism change the way PBS does
2	business, to your knowledge?
3	A No.
4	JUDGE YOUNG: I'm sorry. I wasn't sure
5	from just glancing at this, whether this was a
6	"Children's Television Workshop" decision to accept
7	the sponsor, or a PBS decision.
8	THE WITNESS: Well, it would be both.
9	They would have "Children's Television Workshop"
10	would have approached or been approached by this
11	potential underwriter, in this case Discovery Zone.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: Right.
13	THE WITNESS: So they would have made the
14	deal, and then it would be up to PBS, you know, with
15	our rules regarding underwriting whether or not to
16	determine whether or not it was acceptable to have
17	them as an underwriter, so both would have approved
18	it.
19	JUDGE YOUNG: But does PBS get a cut of
20	the underwriting?
21	THE WITNESS: No.
22	BY MR. TUCCI:

1	Q But doesn't the underwriting, in fact,
2	defray the cost of the production
3	A Sure.
4	Q such that PBS' contribution might be
5	less?
6	A Well, sure, that's the way we operate. I
7	mean, we cobble together funds from a variety of
8	sources to pay for programs, one of them being
9	corporate support, members being another, grants being
10	yet another.
11	JUDGE YOUNG: Well, it says here that Gary
12	Tonelle, Executive VP for Operations at CTW said, "The
13	sponsorship will compensate for PBS' \$3 million cut in
14	yearly funding to CTW under its new contract."
15	THE WITNESS: I presume what that means is
16	that PBS was reducing the funding by \$3 million.
L7	JUDGE YOUNG: Right. And this is being
18	used to make up some
19	THE WITNESS: To supplement part of it.
20	What happens when we have to cut back funding like
21	that, and they don't have a way to make up the
22	difference, is they just produce fewer new episodes,

1	so that's just the way we have to operate. But
2	apparently, this helped with some of it.
3	BY MR. TUCCI:
4	Q Now do you recall in this time frame, the
5	1998-1999 era, whether you were involved in any
6	providing any material to the Discovery Zone in
7	connection with this sponsorship, your group?
8	A I can't remember what I had for lunch
9	yesterday. I certainly don't remember that. I may
10	have, but I just don't recall.
11	Q Now we talked a little bit yesterday about
12	the PBS Sponsorship Group.
13	A Yes, we did.
14	Q Does the PBS Sponsorship Group only seek
15	corporate underwriting of prime time public
16	A No, it's not limited to prime time.
17	Q I see. So the things like the Discovery
18	Zone deal would be something that the PBS Sponsorship
19	Group would be out seeking. Right?
20	A They may have. There's no reason why they
21	shouldn't.
22	Q It wouldn't unusual. Right?

1	A No.
2	Q All right. Do you know how much the PBS
3	Sponsorship brought into BBS in 1998?
4	A No, I don't. It was only started in the
5	summer of '97, so they were just getting up to speed
6	by that time.
7	Q Would the figure \$25 million surprise you?
8	A That sounds like a question on "Antiques
9	Roadshow", another popular prime time program. I'm
10	sorry. I can't answer that. It's a big number, and I
11	don't know whether that's what they brought in or not.
12	I don't get into that very much.
13	Q Do you work with the Sponsorship Group at
14	all?
15	A My staff does for the most part. I rarely
16	get involved with them.
17	Q And what does your staff do, to your
18	knowledge?
19	A Well, you described it earlier. I mean,
20	providing assistance and helping the producer persuade
21	a corporation to help fund the program. So in our
22	case, that could be preparing an audience projection,

1	our estimate of how many people will watch it, or we
2	may provide research similar to what we presented in
3	our case here about the value and the usefulness of
4	public television as a medium for sponsoring a
5	program.
6	Q Has there ever been a situation to your
7	knowledge where the underwriting was committed on say
8	a sliding scale based on some of the ratings that were
9	achieved by the particular program? In other words,
10	if the ratings were higher, the underwriting would be
11	more?
12	A You'd pay more? No, I really don't know
13	of a case like that. I'm not saying that there hasn't
14	been one. I just personally don't know of one, and I
15	don't remember ever hearing anyone making a deal like
16	that. That would get us in the business of make
17	goods, by the way, and I know we don't do make goods.
18	MR. TUCCI: All right. I think I'm
19	through with that document, Your Honor. I'd ask that
20	it be received for impeachment purposes, PS Exhibit
21	27-X.
22	MR. HESTER: No objection.

22

1	JUDGE von KANN: So received.
2	(Whereupon, the document
3	previously marked as PS 27-X
4	for identification was received
5	into evidence.)
6	BY MR. TUCCI:
7	Q Now we spoke a little earlier about
8	underwriting applying to children's programming, as
9	well as the prime time schedule. You know who "Elmo"
10	is, don't you?
11	A Oh, yeah.
12	Q Okay. Do you are you aware that you
13	don't watch "Sesame Street", I take it.
14	A I'm a little out of the target age group.
15	Q Are you aware that until recently when
16	Elmo got on "Sesame Street" and turned on his computer
17	it said, "You've Got Mail"?
18	A That's the first I've heard of that.
19	MR. TUCCI: All right. Let me ask that
20	this be marked as PS Exhibit 28-X.
21	(Whereupon, the above-referred
22	to document was marked as PS

1	28-X for identification.)
2	JUDGE YOUNG: Elmo is a character on
3	"Sesame Street"?
4	THE WITNESS: Yeah, a little red fuzzy
5	guy.
6	BY MR. TUCCI:
7	Q Well, Elmo is a Muppet. Right?
8	A Yeah.
9	MR. TUCCI: Let the record reflect that PS
10	28-X is an article out of the Wall Street Journal
11	on-line dated July 11th, 2002, entitled "Critics claim
12	PBS has gotten too close to its underwriters."
13	A Yeah, I see it.
14	Q Have you seen this article before?
15	A No, it's the first time I've heard of this
16	incident.
17	Q But "You've Got Mail", the AOL
18	sponsorship.
19	A I promise you, I have never heard of this
20	before. I'm sure it was you know, they build a lot
21	of humor into "Sesame Street", and because "You've Got
22	Mail" became sort of part of the culture, I think

1	that's why they must have included it. It sounds like
2	you're headed toward product placement activity.
3	Q Well, you can go there if you like.
4	A I'm not. But I repeat what I said, is
5	that "Sesame Street" has always been big on picking up
6	humor, and they use lots of it within the show. And
7	I don't think there was anybody in the country that
8	didn't know "You've Got Mail" was I mean, it became
9	a catch-phrase for a while.
10	Q Do you know whether I mean, I take it
11	if you didn't know that "You've Got Mail" was on
12	Elmo's computer, you didn't know that PBS was subject
13	to at least one article describing criticism about
14	"You've Got Mail" being on Elmo's computer.
15	A Yes. Yeah, that's news to me.
16	Q If you look at the right-hand column of
17	this article, the first page, it says "Elmo's Friends,
18	some leading corporate underwriters in PBS target
19	kids."
20	A Yes, I see that.
21	Q You see that. Are you aware of Playskool,
22	Kelloggs, General Mills, Leggo and Look Smart

1	contributing over \$1 million each to "sesame street"?
2	MR. HESTER: Your Honor, could I ask for
3	clarification as to time frame for the question, since
4	the article is from 2002?
5	MR. TUCCI: Let me ask him if he's aware
6	of it, and then I'll ask if he was aware of it in a
7	particular year.
8	THE WITNESS: Oh, I hadn't even seen the
9	date.
10	JUDGE von KANN: So I'm sorry, what is the
11	question?
12	BY MR. TUCCI:
13	Q Mr. Fuller, were you aware that
14	underwriting of over \$1 million was provided by the
15	five companies that are listed there, over \$1 million
L6	to "Sesame Street"?
L7	A I wasn't aware of the amounts. I've heard
L8	these names before associated with the program, The
L9	Kellogg Foundation, General Mills, Leggo, Playskool,
20	and so forth.
21	Q To your knowledge, were those companies
22	one foundation, and do they include the ones at the

1	\$500,000 to \$1 million level below there, were they
2	underwriters of "Sesame Street" in the 1998-1999
3	period?
4	A I don't know. I really don't.
5	MR. TUCCI: I don't have any further
6	questions about, Your Honor. I'd ask that it be
7	received as PS Exhibit 28-X for impeachment purposes.
8	MR. HESTER: No objection.
9	JUDGE von KANN: So received.
10	(Whereupon, the document
11	previously marked as PS 28-X
12	for identification was received
13	into evidence.)
14	BY MR. TUCCI:
15	Q Does PBS engage in merchandizing deals, to
16	your knowledge?
17	JUDGE von KANN: Other than tote bags?
18	MR. TUCCI: Yeah, this would be other than
19	tote bags. In other words
20	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure. I'm just kind
21	of searching my mind, and I can't there may be
22	something in some kind I'm sorry. I'm guessing

1	now. I don't know. I just don't know.
2	BY MR. TUCCI:
3	Q Do you know of any instance where PBS gets
4	a cut of say a toy sale?
5	A I don't know.
6	Q A book, or anything like that?
7	A No. I mean, we have a video division. We
8	actually sell videos, but I don't know about anything
9	to do with merchandizing. I'm just the wrong person to
10	ask.
11	Q Well, let's look at one of PTV's exhibits,
12	and it's part of Exhibit 4, which is about an inch
13	thick, so what I'm going to do is I'm going to hand it
14	out, because I don't think
15	JUDGE von KANN: An excerpt from it?
16	MR. TUCCI: No, it's an article. There's
17	about 100 articles in Exhibit 4, I think.
18	JUDGE von KANN: Oh, okay.
19	MR. TUCCI: And what I'm going to do is
20	just give you a copy of the one article because it's
21	the only one that I'm going to ask any questions about
22	out of Exhibit 4. So we'll call it I mean, it's

1	not really even a Demo Exhibit, because it's part of
2	PTV's exhibits that have been received. It's an
3	article out of the August 10th, 1998 Broadcasting and
4	Cable, entitled "PBS keeps its head above cable."
5	JUDGE von KANN: It's probably a good idea
6	to call it a Demo.
7	MR. TUCCI: Okay. That's fine. We'll
8	call it Demo 7. I'm sorry. Mr. Winters says that it
9	should be 8. We'll call it 8, and we'll give you a
10	copy of the chart that we've blown up there, and
11	that's Demo 7.
12	(Whereupon, the above-referred
13	to document was marked as PS
14	Demo 8 for identification.)
15	BY MR. TUCCI:
16	Q Take a minute to look at this article, if
17	you wouldn't mind, Mr. Fuller, while we're doing this.
18	The first part I'm going to ask you about is on page
19	22, and it's under the heading, "Can you say ancillary
20	shares"?
21	A Yes, I was just looking at that.
22	Q I'll just read from it for the record,
I	1

"Keeping the best shows means, in part, coming up with
more money, and PBS has embarked on a broad range of
commercial ventures designed to enhance its
programming war chest."
I'll just skip to the next paragraph and
it begins, "The deals also extend to shares in toys
and books associated with PBS shows, something the
service has been criticized for passing up in earlier
years. You can assume that when we do a new contract
with "Barney", or establish a deal with the
"Teletubbies", ancillary shares of the toy and book
revenue are a part of the contract", Duggan says. Now
who is Mr. Duggan?
A He was the president of PBS, Irvin Duggan.
Q Before Ms. Mitchell?
A Right.
Q Okay. And he goes on to say, "That's the
way the new PBS does business."
A I see that.
Q Okay. And the first full paragraph
actually on the column says, "Though he won't discuss

1	service is striking. But he says the deals
2	collectively have added \$100 million to the PBS budget
3	over the past four years." And this is a 1998
4	article, so the past four years would obviously have
5	been from 1994. Right?
6	A Sure.
7	Q And you weren't aware of any of these
8	deals. Right?
9	A No.
10	Q Okay.
11	A On page 11 of your testimony, you talk
12	about "Reading Rainbow" being one of the shows that
13	encourages kids, or at least as a result of "Reading
14	Rainbow", kids are encouraged to go out ask their
15	parents to go out and buy books from it. Right? Were
16	you aware that at least in some circumstances
17	according to this article, PBS was getting a cut from
18	those books?
19	A I was not aware of that.
20	Q And you go on to say I think in the next
21	page, page 12 of your testimony, that it's your view
22	that going out and buying a book is an okay, but on

1	commercial television, there might be a situation
2	where a kid is perhaps pressuring a parent into buying
3	something that's too pricey. Right?
4	A Or unnecessary.
5	Q Or unnecessary.
6	A Yeah.
7	Q But then, of course, there's going to be
8	circumstances on commercial television where a kid is
9	pressuring his parents to go out and buy a basketball
10	or something that's pretty useful. Right?
11	A There could be.
12	Q Were you involved at all in the launch of
13	the "PBS Kids" portion of PBS? Is that a branding?
14	Let me ask you that.
15	A Yeah, that's branding.
16	Q Okay. So the "PBS Kids" logo that appears
17	on children's program is part of trying to separate
18	those programs, and brand them into PBS. Correct?
19	A That's right, yes. I should say that the
20	reason why they're branding it is because PBS produces
21	interstitial material fed between the programs that
22	tries to benefit the children. It's kind of

1	educational. It's to help them learn, to help them
2	understand themselves and so forth, so all of that is
3	used to tie together and package the service as "PBS
4	Kids". That's the nature of it.
5	Q And I think Mr. Wilson testified yesterday
6	that, or it's actually probably in his written
7	testimony that during the 1998- 99 period, there was
8	a big push with respect to the websites for children's
9	programming in particular, as being another place that
10	children could go to the website for the particular
11	show, and get further information or what have you.
12	Right?
13	A That's right, yes.
14	Q Okay. Do you know when the website for
15	"Sesame Street" or any of those programs were
16	launched? Was that all about in 1998?
17	A I don't know. I really do not.
18	Q Did you have anything to do with the
19	websites for these particular shows?
20	A We do some research for the website, but
21	I don't know if we did them for the children's shows,
22	because there are other people on my staff who do that

1	research.			
2	Q Have you ever looked at the "Sesame			
3	Street" website?			
4	A I may have glanced at it once. I just			
5	don't remember anything about it.			
6	MR. TUCCI: This will be PS Exhibit 29-X,			
7	and we've shot a picture up on the screen there.			
8	(Whereupon, the above-referred			
9	to document was marked as PS			
10	29-X for identification.)			
11	MR. TUCCI: It's the "Sesame Street"			
12	website, the current website. And you said you've			
13	never seen it. You never you don't recall			
14	THE WITNESS: I haven't seen this page.			
15	MR. TUCCI: Okay. This is the Home Page.			
16	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.			
17	MR. TUCCI: I think the way it works is			
18	you go to "PBS Kids", and then you hit the specific			
19	show, and then you go to the show's specific page.			
20	THE WITNESS: That sounds right.			
21	MR. TUCCI: Okay. And you look on the			
22	bottom there, we've got AOL.			

1	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.	
2	MR. TUCCI: And we've got Spaghetti-Os.	
3	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.	
4	MR. TUCCI: And we've got Quaker Oatmeal.	
5	THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.	
6	BY MR. TUCCI:	
7	Q Okay. Did you know that those are	
8	hyperlinks?	
9	A No.	
10	Q Okay. That a kid can go and in two clicks	
11	on that AOL icon, go to the Home Page for AOL. Do you	
12	know what PBS gets for that?	
13	A No.	
14	Q And there's AOL. Okay.	
15	A Keep in mind, this is a choice thing.	
16	It's different from when you're watching a television	
17	program, and you have no choice but to see all these,	
18	you know, like 12 minutes of commercials. Here they	
19	can ignore it, if they choose to. It's not right in	
20	your face. It's there, to be sure.	
21	MR. TUCCI: I'd ask that Exhibit 29-X be	
22	received for impeachment purposes. WE're going to	

1	look at another one of these. Here's the one for
2	"Arthur". I'll pass that one around.
3	JUDGE von KANN: Find out if Mr. Hester
4	has any objection.
5	MR. HESTER: I don't have any objection.
6	I'm relying on what you said, Mr. Tucci, this is the
7	current website. Okay.
8	JUDGE von KANN: So received.
9	MR. TUCCI: And I think I asked Mr.
10	Fuller, but if I didn't, you don't have any idea what
11	this website looked like in 1998 or 1999.
12	THE WITNESS: No. No.
13	MR. TUCCI: You don't have any current
14	recollection.
15	THE WITNESS: No.
16	JUDGE von KANN: Received for impeachment.
17	(Whereupon, the document
18	previously marked as PS 29-X
19	for identification was received
20	into evidence.)
21	MR. TUCCI: Okay. Here's the "Arthur"
22	website. This will be PS 30-X.

1	(Whereupon, the above-referred	
2	to document was marked as PS	
3	30-X for identification.)	
4	MR. TUCCI: And again, it has hyperlinks,	
5	and it also has right there on the bottom Juicey Juice	
6	and Alphabets. Do you know whether Juicey Juice and	
7	Alphabets are under I'm sorry, there's another one.	
8	There's Chuck E Cheese too. Juicey Juice, Alphabets	
9	and Chuck E Cheese, do you know whether their	
10	underwriters of "Arthur"?	
11	THE WITNESS: At one time or another they	
12	had been. I don't know if they are currently, but	
13	apparently they are, according to this.	
14	BY MR. TUCCI:	
15	Q Do you know how much they contribute	
16	either individually or in the aggregate?	
17	A No, I don't know anything about the dollar	
18	amounts. I don't get into that, Mr. Tucci.	
19	MR. TUCCI: That's 30-X. We'd ask that it	
20	be received for impeachment purposes.	
21	MR. HESTER: And could I again ask for	
22	clarification if that is the current website?	

1	MR. TUCCI: That is the current website.
2	MR. HESTER: I have no objection to it
3	coming on.
4	JUDGE von KANN: All right. So received.
5	(Whereupon, the document
6	previously marked as PS 30-X
7	for identification was received
8	into evidence.)
9	MR. TUCCI: 31 will be the website for
10	"Barney", which a child can go to.
11	(Whereupon, the above-referred
12	to document was marked as PS
13	31-X for identification.)
14	BY MR. TUCCI:
15	Q This one only has one. It's Chuck E
16	Cheese is the underwriter, so it's a repeat
17	underwriter. Right?
18	A I guess.
19	Q Okay. And you don't have any knowledge
20	about how much Chuck E Cheese pays to underwrite
21	"Barney"?
22	A No.

1	Q Do you have any idea how long Chuck E
2	Cheese has underwritten "Barney"?
3	A No.
4	MR. TUCCI: I'd ask that 31-X be received
5	under the same stipulation, if you'd like.
6	JUDGE von KANN: As the current website.
7	MR. TUCCI: The current website.
8	JUDGE von KANN: All right. Received for
9	impeachment.
10	(Whereupon, the document
11	previously marked as PS 31-X
12	for identification was received
13	into evidence.)
14	MR. TUCCI: And finally, we have "Dragon
15	Tales", which will be 32-X.
16	(Whereupon, the above-referred
17	to document was marked as PS
18	32-X for identification.)
19	BY MR. TUCCI
20	Q This one is pretty interesting, and a
21	little different than the other ones, in that do you
22	recall this morning we were talking about sugary

1	cereal being advertised on commercial television,	
2	children's programs?	
3	A Yes, I said that.	
4	Q And I think Kelloggs is the sponsor or the	
5	underwriter, at least now, of "Dragon Tales". And if	
6	you look real closely, the actual cereals that	
7	Kelloggs is identifying at the bottom of the "Dragon	
8	Tales" website are Kelloggs Frosted Flakes and Fruit	
9	Loops. Do you see that?	
10	A Yeah, that's mentioned right there. There	
11	are no commercials on this website, Mr. Tucci.	
12	Q Well, you can click twice and you'd be	
13	right on that Frosted Flakes website, can't you?	
14	A That's right.	
15	MR. TUCCI: All right. That's 32-X, and	
16	I'd ask that it be received for impeachment purposes	
17	under the same stipulation.	
18	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Hester.	
19	MR. HESTER: Stipulation that it's the	
20	current website.	
21	JUDGE von KANN: Right.	
22	MR. HESTER: Yes. On that basis, I don't	

1	have an objection to it.
2	(Whereupon, the document
3	previously marked as PS 32-X
4	for identification was received
5	into evidence.)
6	BY MR. TUCCI:
7	Q In your testimony, in the same sort of
8	general area, you talk about the value of
9	commercial-free in the PBS broadcast.
10	A Yeah, I said that.
11	Q You've testified in these proceedings
12	before. Right?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Okay. And you realize that the charge of
L5	the CARP in this matter is to determine the market
16	value of the programming. Is that right?
L7	A Yes, that's my understanding.
L8	Q That's been broadcast on a distant signal
L9	basis.
20	A Distant signal, yes.
21	Q And the fact that PBS programming is
22	sometimes, or it could be viewed as being

1	commercial-free, that deals with the format. Right?	
2	A Well, it means that we do yeah, in a	
3	general sense. We don't interrupt the program and	
4	insert commercial messages.	
5	Q And how would that be any different than	
6	say a broadcast that was broadcast in like Dolby	
7	Stereo or wide-screen format? I mean, those are	
8	format things. Right?	
9	A I don't see how you'd compare that here.	
10	Q Well, it's the way the program is	
11	presented. Right?	
12	A Yeah.	
13	Q It's presented without commercial	
14	interruption.	
15	A Right.	
16	Q But the programming content is the same,	
17	whether it has commercial interruptions or not.	
18	Right?	
19	A Yeah. It's the same, it's just that	
20	there's less of it if you have commercials.	
21	Q And there is this proceeding is charged	
22	with compensating copyright owners that own that	

1	program conte	ent. Right?
2	A Y	es.
3	r Q	o your knowledge?
4	A Y	es.
5	Q N	Now do you know that TIVO is?
6	A Y	Teah. I don't own one, but I've heard it
7	been talked a	about.
8	Q M	Maybe you should explain it so that we all
9	understand it.	
10	A W	hat a TIVO device is?
11	Q Y	es.
12	A A	s I understand it, it's a circuitry
13	I'm getting a	little over my head here. It's I'm
14	going blank o	n it. I know it will delay a program as
15	you're watching it. And I can't remember if it's got	
16	a VCR built in	nto it, or a DVD or what, because I don't
17	own one. But	I know it's a way of time shifting.
18	QI	t's a device that will take a program and
19	basically cut	t the commercials out. Is that your
20	understanding	?
21	A Y	ou can do that, yes.
22	QI	t's one of the things that you can do

1	with a TIVO. Right?
2	A Yeah.
3	Q You can sort of do that with a remote
4	control too, can't you?
5	A Yeah, that's right.
6	Q And except for Ms. Mitchell, we're all men
7	in this room. We've always been stereotyped as being
8	people who change the channel all the time. Right?
9	A You haven't met my wife.
10	(Laughter.)
11	Q I mean, the point is, is that, you know,
12	you can get around commercials if you want to, can't
13	you?
14	A You can, and I've seen some studies that
15	have tried to investigate TIVO on this point, and
16	they're conflicting, so I'm not sure whether people
17	are doing it or not. I think what I've seen is that
18	they're mostly not.
19	Q And I think at one point in your testimony
20	you talk about the pleasures of watching
21	commercial-free television.
22	Δ Veah

1	Q Do you remember that? And I take it you'd
2	agree with me that commercially interrupted television
3	is much more highly rated than commercial-free
4	television. Isn't that right?
5	A That doesn't follow.
6	Q No, I mean, it's just a question. Is
7	commercially interrupted television more highly rated
8	than non-commercially interrupted?
9	A Some is, some isn't.
10	Q As a general rule.
11	A No, I'm not going to answer that that way.
12	Q All right. That's fine. That's fine.
13	A Because, you know, there's like hundreds
14	of channels now with teeny-tiny ratings.
15	Q Does broadcast television, in general,
16	have higher ratings than PBS?
17	A In general. There are like UPN and WB
18	are close to PBS in ratings, if you're talking
19	strictly about broadcast. And then Fox, and ABC, CBS,
20	NBC, yes, they have higher ratings.
21	Q And they're commercially interrupted.
22	Right?

1	A Yes, they are. But remember, if you ask
2	a person whether they want them there or not, then we
3	go back to the results we saw in that earlier study.
4	They don't have any choice but to watch what's offered
5	in programming like, you know, "NYPD Blue", for
6	example.
7	Q But we know what they do. Right?
8	A They do. The put up with it.
9	JUDGE von KANN: Or they go to the rest
10	room.
11	MR. TUCCI: Or they plug in the TIVO, or
12	they hit the remote, or they do whatever.
13	THE WITNESS: Yeah.
14	JUDGE von KANN: My grandmother years ago
15	when she'd watch TV, this was before remote controls,
16	she had as a device, had a wire coming from the set,
17	and it had a volume control. She called it the "Blab
18	Off", and as soon as the commercials came on, she'd
19	grab it and turn it down until
20	THE WITNESS: I think the early Zeniths
21	had that. My uncle had one of those. She should have
22	patented it.

1	MR. TUCCI: Your Honor, as yesterday, no
2	time is any better than the other. I'm happy to keep
3	going. I'm happy to stop here. Whatever your
4	pleasure.
5	JUDGE von KANN: Well, I take it you have
6	more than a few minutes.
7	MR. TUCCI: I do have more than a few
8	minutes.
9	JUDGE von KANN: Well, why don't we
10	this is a good time. Let's break until 2:00.
11	MR. TUCCI: Okay.
12	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
13	above-entitled matter went off the record at 1:03 p.m.
14	and resumed at 2:03 p.m.)
15	JUDGE VON KANN: Okay. Mr. Tucci, you're
16	on.
17	BY MR. TUCCI:
18	Q All right. Before we broke, Mr. Fuller,
19	we were talking about commercial interruptions
20	A Yes, we were.
21	Q in public television. Let me hand you
22	what we will mark for identification as PS Exhibit

33-X, and represent that it was provided to the
Program Suppliers by counsel for PBS as a document
underlying your testimony.
(Whereupon, the above-referred
to document was marked as PS
Exhibit No. 33-X for
identification.)
It's entitled PBS Brand Versus Cable
Brands: Assessing the Brand Image of Public
Television in a Multi-Channel Environment, written by
Sylvia M. Chan-Olmstead and Yung Wok Kim. Have you
ever seen this document before?
A Yes.
Q Okay. And it's from the Journal of
Broadcasting and Electronic Media, June 2002.
A That's right.
Q Okay. Did you commission this study?
A No.
Q Did somebody at PBS?
A Not to my knowledge.
Q Okay. If you wouldn't mind, turn to
page 315, which is PTV 00249.

A All right. I have it.

Q And 250 actually. Those are the two pages that I'm going to concentrate on. At the top of 249 it starts, "The discretion and conclusion." The middle part of that, the author stated, "It seems that the equity of public television today rests largely on its 'quality' and 'trustworthiness' image. Favorite networks such as A&E and Nickelodeon, while offering highly rated similar programming, were not able to garner the same level of trust that many audiences have placed on public television.

"The authors believe that viewers' perception of public television as a non-commercial entity is the root of such trust and should continue to serve as an important differentiating point for public television in its marketing effort, especially in the area of children's programming.

"On the other hand, evidence seems to indicate that public television has not been able to develop beyond the quality, intelligent, and trustworthiness brand image since PBS was perceived to be much less exciting than most comparable cable

1	networks." Do you see where I am?
2	A I do.
3	Q Okay. Did PBS have any response to this,
4	to your knowledge?
5	A Not that I know of.
6	Q Okay. And, again, we were talking before
7	we broke about the commercial-free format of PBS not
8	being something that is different than the actual
9	content of PBS programming, do you remember that?
10	A Yes.
11	Q On page 250, at the top of the page
12	it's in the paragraph that continues from PTV 000249,
13	I'm reading from the middle, the sentence that begins,
14	"Their strategic response" do you follow me?
15	A Yes, I see it.
16	Q Okay. "Their strategic response has
17	proved to be the key to reinventing public television
18	for the next digital, multi-channel media era.
19	Finally, based on the brand perception discovered in
20	this study, the authors would argue against the notion
21	of privatizing public broadcasting services or any
22	commercial activities, e.g. commercial minutes, that

1	might dilute the trustworthiness equity of public
2	television. In other words, excessive moves towards
3	commercialism would risk turning public television
4	into simply another competing cable network, forsaking
5	its strong equity, apparently unmatched by its cable
6	counterpart." Do you see that?
7	A I do.
8	Q Okay. Had you read this study before?
9	A I had only seen the summary information
10	from it. I had not seen the whole study.
11	Q Okay. Have you discussed this study with
12	anybody at PBS?
13	A No.
14	MR. TUCCI: Your Honor, I'd ask that
15	Exhibit 33-X be received as impeachment material.
16	MR. HESTER: No objection.
17	JUDGE VON KANN: All right. It will be.
18	MR. TUCCI: Actually, again, Your Honor,
19	this was a document that was provided as underlying
20	Mr. Fuller's testimony, so I think it probably would
21	be more properly received
22	MR. HESTER: It's cited in his testimony.

1	And if Mr. Tucci wants to admit it to present it as
2	substantive evidence, we don't have an objection.
3	JUDGE VON KANN: All right. It is
4	received.
5	(Whereupon, the above-referred
6	to document, previously marked
7	as PS Exhibit No. 33-X for
8	identification, was received in
9	evidence.)
10	BY MR. TUCCI:
11	Q Let's talk a little bit about ratings, Mr.
12	Fuller. I think you testified earlier that ratings
13	are one of the main components of the reports that
14	your group prepares, correct?
15	A Yes, they are.
16	Q And they're important to PBS.
17	A Yes, they are.
18	Q And I think they're important in
19	children's programming, in particular, right?
20	A Well, they're a form of evaluation.
21	Q And we know that, from yesterday and from
22	this morning, and I think even in your written

(202) 234-4433

1	testimony, that the children's programming on PBS is
2	highly rated. It's some of the most highly rated
3	programming in television, right?
4	A Not on a household basis. But on a target
5	audience basis, it is. If you focus on the children
6	two to five, those ratings can be high.
7	Q And you believe that high ratings equal
8	loyal watchers, don't you?
9	A I can't translate that into loyalty
10	necessarily. It certainly means that they that a
11	lot of people watch it at a given moment. I would
12	probably assume no, I can't assume that either.
13	That's the end of my answer.
14	Q Okay. When you testified earlier about
15	the 28 percent of U.S. households have children under
16	the age of 12, do you know what the percentage of U.S.
17	cable households who have children under the age of 12
18	is?
19	A No, I don't.
20	Q Okay. Is there any particular reason you
21	used U.S. households as opposed to cable households in
22	citing that?
	I

1	A No. But from what I recall, cable
2	households tend to be younger households. And for
3	that reason they probably have more children in them.
4	Q Okay. But you haven't seen that
5	statistic, I take it?
6	A Not recently.
7	Q And is there some reason you picked 12 as
8	the cutoff for that statistic? Why didn't you use
9	under six, let's say?
LO	A Well, because we do make some effort to
L1	try to reach the children in the six to 11 range.
L2	Q I think you'd agree with me that the
L3	children's programming that's on PBS is generally
L4	targeted to younger kids than 12, right?
L5	A Most of it is, yes.
.6	Q And the highly rated programming that's on
.7	PBS is, in fact, highly rated by those that are under
L8	12, right?
.9	A Yes. It's two to fives and also fairly
20	substantially the six to nine-year old group, or six
21	to eight. Six to eight.
22	Q And those are the shows that we were

1	looking at, like the Sesame Street, the Barney, the
2	Arthur, and Dragon Tales. Those are the four most
3	highly rated, right?
4	A Yes, I think that's right. I don't know
5	if we've left any out, but certainly those are higher
6	rated.
7	Q If you would, get out the exhibits for
8	public television, please. We're going to look at
9	some that are under the tab of Exhibit 5, which is a
10	series of memos starting I think October 9, 1997, and
11	then going basically through the two years 1998 and
12	1999. Do you see where I am?
13	A I do.
14	Q Okay. The first one there is dated
15	October 9, 1997, right?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Okay. And it says to General Managers,
18	Program Managers, Advertising and Promotion Managers,
19	from Kathy Quattrone, John Wilson, Steven Gray, Shawn
20	Halford, Carol Field Feld, excuse me and Judy
21	Vaughn, is it?
22	A Vraughn.

1	Q Vraughn.
2	A Yes.
3	Q Do you receive these memoranda? Did you
4	receive this particular memorandum?
5	A No, I did not.
6	Q Okay. Does your group provide any
7	information, either directly or indirectly, that's
8	used in this in this memorandum and the ones that
9	we're going to talk about after it?
10	A Well, this came from the Program
11	Department, and they do use our data. I don't know
12	whether we contributed directly to this. Probably
13	indirectly.
14	Q Okay. Would you look at page 4 of this
15	first memo, please?
16	A I'm there.
17	Q Are you there?
18	A I'm there.
19	Q And the first bullet I guess under the
20	paragraph says, "NOVA's new winter/spring season
21	includes a hit for sweeps, Surviving Everest (WT)."
22	Whatever that means.

1	A Working title.
2	Q Working title. Okay. Do you see that?
3	A I do.
4	Q Why does PBS care about sweeps?
5	A Well, that's when Nielsen conducts local
6	market surveys, and the stations would like to make
7	sure that they have good programming so that they can
8	get a good read on their audiences.
9	Q And you compare that data, I take it, to
LO	the sweep data for the other cable networks and
L1	broadcast networks as well, right?
L2	A Well, the broadcast networks. I don't
L3	think they pay much attention to the cable networks.
L 4	Q When you are providing information to
.5	underwriters, do you provide prime-time information,
.6	sweep information, total day information, or does it
.7	just depend?
.8	A Well, if you're talking about corporate
.9	underwriting, first of all, we're not looking at
20	sweeps. That's really it really doesn't matter
21	that much. We focus more on the national audiences
2	whenever a program airs, because we can obtain

1	measurements whenever we wish, not just limited to the
2	sweep months.
3	Q Do you have have you ever heard of an
4	underwriting asking for sweep rating information?
5	A Not in my department I haven't. I think
6	that's a local market concern.
7	Q Let's look at the next one, if you will,
8	which it goes on for a bit. You're probably going to
9	have to go through about 20 pages
10	A Okay.
11	Q to get to May 29, 1998.
12	A I have it.
13	Q Okay. And I'm going to look at page 9,
14	the paragraph at the bottom of the page, where it
15	says, "Our program promotion work will focus on
16	building: 1) tune in to increase the amount of time
17	viewing and using our programs, and 2) program
18	awareness/image to help close the gap between actual
19	viewership of our programs and people's perceptions
20	about their viewing behavior." Do you see where I am?
21	A I do.
22	Q Is there an issue at PBS with well, let

1	me ask it this way. Have you seen studies that
2	reflect people answering that they watch PBS more than
3	the empirical data would suggest or would
4	substantiate?
5	A I've seen that for every network. If you
6	just ask people to recall their viewing, sometimes
7	they will inflate it. It's just memory artifact.
8	Q There's not a particular issue with people
9	saying, as far as PBS is concerned, public
10	television
11	A No.
12	Q that they I'll finish the question
13	that they perceive that they watch more public
14	television than they actually do. Is that my
15	understanding of your answer?
16	A I'm reviewing some studies that we have
17	done that don't really translate into ratings. It
18	depends on how the question is asked. But I think
19	that in general people will overstate viewing a little
20	when just asked over the telephone, "Have you watched
21	something?" within a given period of time.
22	Q So you're saying that

1	A That's my recollection.
2	Q As I understand your testimony, the issue
3	is no different for PBS than it is for ABC or NBC or
4	anybody else, is that right?
5	A There is a let me think about that a
6	minute, because I've seen different things. I
7	apologize for taking time, but I
8	Q That's all right.
9	A Here's what I'm thinking. If you ask a
10	broad question, such as, "Have you watched some
11	particular channel during the past month?" it's a very
12	it's kind of a vague criterion, and people will
13	tend to say yes for whatever channel you're asking
14	about.
15	If it's a form of inquiry where people can
16	think about it a little, you run into something else.
17	I'm going back to my Arbitron days. We did a lot of
18	tests on diaries, which are handwritten questionnaires
19	that the respondents fill out. And there you had a
20	reverse phenomenon. People are doing this from
21	memory, and there there was a bias in favor of a

bias against the less viewed networks.

22

1	If you were one of the major networks that
2	was watched a lot, people tended to get that right.
3	We could compare that to other data sources we had to
4	confirm it. Because they watch it a lot, they
5	remember it pretty well. But for those that they
6	didn't watch very often, including PBS, they tended to
7	understate their viewing to it.
8	So, and we see that phenomenon going on
9	today. It's worse today than it used to be.
10	Q But this is actually focused on the
11	reverse of that, isn't it, where people are reporting
12	that they're watching it more than actually maybe the
13	empirical data suggests?
14	A That's what you were asking about. I
15	mean, and I'm not sure what the statement is about
16	here.
17	Q Okay. You didn't write it?
18	A No, I did not write it. I don't know what
19	they're referencing.
20	Q Okay. Have you ever, in your capacity as
21	head of research for PBS, have you ever undertaken any
22	study that deals with the issue of people's perception

1	about their viewing of PBS versus their actual viewing
2	of PBS?
3	A I don't think we have.
4	Q And you already testified that you don't
5	recall seeing anything that was directly specific to
6	PBS, is that right?
7	A Not like that, no.
8	Q If you wouldn't mind, go beyond go
9	another 20 pages, if you will, until you see the memo
10	dated May 26, 1999, to General Managers, Program
11	Managers, Advertising and Promotion Managers.
12	A Did you say February 26?
13	Q May 26.
14	A Oh, I'm sorry.
L5	Q 1999.
16	A I have it.
L7	Q At the bottom of that first page, it's
L8	actually the second sentence from the bottom, it says,
L9	"The 8:00 p.m. programs will deliver a strong lead-in
20	to NOVA at 9:00, which will in turn bring a sizeable
21	audience to Frontline at 10:00 p.m." Do you see that?
22	A Yes, I do.

1	Q Okay. Was that the notion that we were
2	talking about yesterday of common carriage and trying
3	to have programs in prime time which are scheduled in
4	such a way that you maximize the audience that stayed
5	with the PBS programming?
6	A Well, for those stations that keep the two
7	programs together, yes. And that's what is assumed
8	here in this statement, that the two will be added
9	together, but we do find stations that will shift them
10	apart and insert something else in between them. So
11	it's up to the stations.
12	Q Is this something that your department
13	would track, how many folks tuned in at 8:00 p.m., and
L4	then stayed on for the 9:00 p.m. showing of NOVA, and
L5	then stayed on for Frontline at 10:00?
L6	A We would if the scheduling department
L7	asked us to.
L8	Q Okay. But it's not one of the routine
L9	things that you would do?
20	A No. It's more done on a special like
21	a diagnostic request.
22	Q You talk I think at page 23 in your

1	testimony about viewer avidity and ratings. Do you
2	recall that?
3	A I do.
4	Q Okay. And what do you mean by "viewer
5	avidity"?
6	A Enthusiasm for the programming.
7	Q Are there ways to measure empirical
8	ways to measure viewer avidity?
9	A There probably are. This is mostly
10	speaking just from experience and anecdotal you
11	know, what we hear people say, plus the fact that, you
12	know, as we've said before, we have a pretty high
13	percent of people viewers who actually give us
14	money, you know, when they didn't have to, members,
15	contributors.
16	So all of that, plus, you know, what we
17	hear people tell us in their letters and their e-mail
18	and their phone calls, suggests that they are pretty
19	avid about many of our programs.
20	Q Have you reviewed the Program Suppliers
21	direct case in this matter?
22	A No.

1	Q Have you ever seen a Nielsen report that
2	tries to express viewing or uses a ratio to express
3	the viewing as a percentage of time?
4	A Oh, I stand corrected. I have seen some
5	of that of that direct case. I did. I wasn't sure
6	what you were talking about. And I did see where they
7	were using the time, the average number of minutes, I
8	believe compiled by Nielsen.
9	Q Is that one way one could empirically
10	determine or empirically gather avidity numbers?
11	A Not in my experience. That has nothing to
12	do with avidity. I mean, that's just volume or
13	tonnage of viewing, you know. It doesn't tell you
14	anything except what it is. It's not avidity.
15	Nielsen doesn't measure avidity.
16	Q Okay. Could we take that a step further
17	and have volume have a ratio of volume in viewing
18	and put the two of them together to measure avidity?
19	A No. That still doesn't indicate avidity.
20	Q So viewing the time ratio would not be
21	valuable to measure avidity, in your view?
22	A No. It's just standardizing the

1	statistic, you know, like average minutes per quarter-
2	hour viewed. And the fact that you spend a lot of
3	time watching something doesn't mean you are avid
4	about it. And I would say that for any television.
5	You know, you can watch you can go to sleep during
6	a three-hour movie or a football game. I've seen my
7	father do that many times.
8	Q How about quintile data? Do you know what
9	that is?
10	A Yes.
11	Q What does that mean?
12	A Well, that's when you divide the audience
13	up into five groups, equal size groups, based on the
14	amount of time spent watching a particular channel.
15	Or it could be well, more typically, it's watching
16	television. So you have heavy viewers, slightly heavy
17	viewers, moderate viewers, light viewers, and very
18	light viewers. And then often times that's used to
19	then calculate within a given group what channels they
20	watch.
21	Q Do you believe that quintile data could
22	provide any evidence of avidity?

1	A No, it's the same thing. It's all based
2	on time spent. You need some kind of a psychological
3	measure to get at what I understand avidity to be.
4	Q And I noticed on page 21 of your testimony
5	you talked about the weary woman rocking a baby at
6	3:00 a.m., is that what you're talking about here when
7	you talk about the television being on?
8	A Yes.
9	Q You didn't mean to suggest that the core
10	of the Program Suppliers viewers were weary women
11	watching some show rocking their baby at 3:00 a.m.,
12	did you?
13	A That's just one anecdote.
14	Q Let's talk about look-alikes. If you
15	would, turn to Exhibit 21, which is one of the
16	exhibits to your testimony, and it's entitled Monthly
17	License Fees Charged by Selected Cable Networks. Do
18	you see that?
19	A I do see it.
20	Q And some of them are highlighted actually
21	at the top and some of them aren't. And I understood
22	your testimony to be that you were comparing, at least

1	on a general basis, the ones that are highlighted as
2	having some attributes of the "look-alike," is that
3	right?
4	A That's right.
5	Q Okay. Let me
6	A Although I'll confess, I don't know why
7	MTV and Lifetime are highlighted. Well, it may be
8	that some of these channels have some program that's
9	something like PBS's. That's all I can guess.
10	Q The top ones, The Discovery Channel, The
11	Learning Channel, Nickelodeon I don't know why
12	you'd have MTV in there.
13	MR. HESTER: I just think maybe I can
14	clarify for the record I think it's not anything as
15	sophisticated as was suggested. I think it's just a
16	glitch in the presentation of the exhibit.
17	MR. TUCCI: PBS, MTV, they go together,
18	right?
19	(Laughter.)
20	BY MR. TUCCI:
21	Q This is going to be PS Exhibit 34-X, and
22	it's entitled Cable Audience Report. It says "from

1	PBS Research" in the upper left-hand corner. Do you
2	see that?
3	(Whereupon, the above-referred
4	to document was marked as PS
5	Exhibit No. 34-X for
6	identification.)
7	A That's us.
8	Q That's what I thought. This is one of the
9	reports that your department puts together, right?
10	A That's right.
11	Q Okay. And this was presented or
12	produced to the Program Suppliers by your counsel in
13	this proceeding. It's dated, compiled by Beth Walsh,
14	PBS Research, 12/30/99, and it's PTV 000904 down at
15	the bottom.
16	I'd like for you to turn to page 914,
17	please, in this document.
18	A I'm sorry. Page what?
19	Q PTV if you look in the bottom right-
20	hand corner
21	A Yes, yes, I see that.
22	Q Okay. 914.
1	!

1	A 914. Okay. All right, I have it.
2	Q It says, "Appendix 3, Monday-Sunday Full
3	Day Audience Trends, '94/'95, '98/'99," do you see
4	that?
5	A I do.
6	Q Okay. And this is the listing of average
7	ratings on the left and weekly cum ratings on the
8	right, correct?
9	A That's right, 24 hours a day.
10	Q Okay. And on the left-hand side we've got
11	broadcast, PBS, and networks, and then we have basic
12	cable listed under that, and the pay cable at the
13	bottom, right?
14	A Yes, we do.
15	Q Okay. I believe you were here yesterday
16	when you heard and you heard Mr. Wilson testify
17	that the look-alikes have are a competitor, at
18	least to some degree, to PBS, do you remember that?
19	A Yes, I remember that.
20	Q And you agree with that?
21	A Yes, they are to some extent.
22	Q Now, we can look at the ratings for the

1	look-alikes by looking at this page, right?
2	A Yes, at least for the 24-hour day part.
3	Q Right. And we can look at PBS's 24-hour
4	ratings.
5	A That's right.
6	Q Okay. Let's engage in a little exercise.
7	A Before you do that, could I just
8	Q Sure.
9	A make a comment on this interpreting
10	this? PBS stations, for the most part, the great most
11	part, are not on the air 24 hours a day. These cable
12	networks are. So most of our stations sign off around
13	midnight or 1:00. So these ratings have been deflated
14	by the fact that this is a 24-hour measurement.
15	You know, so Nielsen is counting the hours
16	from 1:00 a.m. until the station signs back on again
17	like at 6:00 in the morning, as part of the
18	denominator. And as a result, it causes our rating to
19	go down. I'm sure that if it would be slightly
20	higher than what you see here if that were not done,
21	if it were just our broadcast day. So I just want
22	everyone to understand that, that it's a little bit

1	apples to oranges.
2	Q That leads me sort of to two questions.
3	Number one, the weary woman at 3:00 in the morning
4	wouldn't have PTV available to watch, would she?
5	A Probably no.
6	Q And, number two that was sort of
7	anecdotal, but nobody laughed.
8	A Yes.
9	(Laughter.)
10	In a few markets they would.
11	Q And the other question is: has the amount
12	of broadcast time for PTV increased over
13	A Do you mean the length of the broadcast
14	day?
15	Q The length of the broadcast day, yes.
16	A For the average station.
17	Q For the average station over the decade of
18	the '90s.
19	A It's my perception that it has some. But
20	I don't know the exact numbers.
21	Q So the point that you just made may have
22	a different impact at the beginning of the decade than

1	it actually has at the end of the decade, is that
2	right?
3	A Possibly a little, yes. It's not a
4	wholesale thing, because it's expensive to stay on the
5	air all night. And stations have been on hard times
6	for several years, so I imagine if there was a trend
7	it's probably been stanched.
8	Q Now, we were talking a little bit about
9	the competition from cable networks, the look-alike
10	cable networks. Mr. Wilson couldn't remember
11	yesterday all of the program defections, I'll call
12	them, that situations where there is a PBS program
13	that actually has shown up on a cable network.
14	A Oh, right.
15	Q Are you familiar with that happening?
16	A Yes. There have been a few examples. I
17	think I have some in my testimony.
18	Q Right. And one of them was Nickelodeon
19	actually shows Sesame Street reruns, is that right?
20	Do you know that?
21	A Yes, I think some of the older ones.
22	Q Okay. And actually, it was the article
	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

1	that we went through that PBS keeps its head above
2	cable, which is part of Exhibit 4, actually lists
3	them. So just so the record is clear and I think
4	that in April 1998, Nickelodeon this is a quote,
5	"Nickelodeon bought the rights to the entire
6	Children's Television Workshop, including Sesame
7	Street reruns."
8	A What page are you on?
9	Q We're on page 21. Do you see where the
10	picture is of the farmer's wife? If you don't have
11	it, that's let me just ask you if that's your
12	recollection.
13	A I'm sorry. I don't know what you're
14	looking at.
15	JUDGE VON KANN: Page 21 of what?
16	MR. TUCCI: It's the article that is part
17	of Exhibit 4, which is the one that was buried in the
18	middle of about 100 articles. So I handed it out
19	separately. It's called we actually put a number
20	on it. It's Demo 8. Sorry.
21	THE WITNESS: Oh, that's the broadcasting
22	and cable article.

1	MR. TUCCI: That's correct.
2	THE WITNESS: Okay. Let's start over.
3	MR. TUCCI: Okay.
4	JUDGE VON KANN: And what page are we
5	looking at?
6	MR. TUCCI: 21.
7	BY MR. TUCCI:
8	Q It's the paragraph immediately to the
9	right of the picture. It says, "Just this year, cable
10	channels engineered two key defections." Do you see
11	where I am?
12	A I do.
13	Q In April, Nickelodeon bought the rights to
14	the entire Children's Television Workshop, including
15	Sesame Street reruns, for its planned commercial-free
16	educational network. The deal came on the heels of
17	discovery communications packed with BBC to deliver a
18	BBC America cable channel. Like the Nickelodeon
19	channel, the BBC channel will carry reruns once
20	available in the United States only on PBS."
21	The first sentence in the next paragraph
22	goes on, "Other defections have included Scholastic

Productions' decision last year to sell reruns of the
PBS animated series The Magic School Bus to Fox for
broadcast this fall."
My point is simply that the competitive
environment has included competition for viewers as
well as competition for program
A The product, yes, that's correct.
Q Okay.
A I'm puzzled by that statement about
Nickelodeon buying the rights to the entire Children's
Television Workshop. I may be wrong, but I just don't
remember anything like that. I knew that they had
oought the rights to reruns of that programs that
are out of the rights period for PBS. We have a
three-year rights window, and I think they sold the
older ones to them. But I don't know about them
ouying the entire thing, so I'm puzzled. I wonder if
the reporter didn't botch that up.
Q I only know what I read in your
A Yes, I know.
Q the exhibits to your testimony.
A I understand.

1	JUDGE GULIN: Mr. Tucci, are you finished
2	with Exhibit 21?
3	MR. TUCCI: Actually, we're going to come
4	back to it right now.
5	BY MR. TUCCI:
6	Q And when a cable operator makes a choice
7	between carrying PBS as a distant signal and as a
8	cable look-like, I mean, there's a cost differential
9	there, isn't there? Are you aware of that?
10	A A cable operator
11	Q Yes.
12	A making a decision to carry PBS as a
13	distant signal versus carrying some cable network?
14	Q Correct.
15	A Yes. Yes, there's a cost differential.
16	Q And PBS is markedly cheaper, isn't it?
17	A It's one-fourth, as I understand.
18	Q Well, that's
19	A Well, there was some ratio in there that
20	was set by statute. I think that can be said.
21	Q I'm talking about a cable network versus
22	PBS as a distant signal. Well, let me just

A Oh, oh, I'm sorry. Yes, I got the two
confused. Well, yes. I don't know what the costs
amount to for PBS as a distant signal, but I know that
they do the cable networks do charge cents per
subscribers
Q Right.
A which is negotiated.
Q Right. And we have some of those license
fees listed on your Exhibit 21, right?
A That's right.
Q Let's look at 1998 for Nickelodeon, just
because, to be honest with you, that's the one I did
the math for. So I won't have to redo the math if we
look at Nickelodeon.
There was a per subscriber license fee in
1998 of 55 cents. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Okay. Now, we can figure out the
difference we can figure out what a hypothetical
cable operator would pay for Nickelodeon given this
example, and we could also figure out what the
hypothetical cable operator would pay for a PTV

1	distant signal as well, couldn't we?
2	A If you say so.
3	Q Okay. Well, let's try it, and we'll see
4	how far we can go with this.
5	A A lot of assumptions there.
6	Q Right. Did you read the testimony of Dr.
7	Johnson that's part of the PTV case?
8	A I've just glanced at the conclusions. I
9	haven't read the entire testimony.
10	Q Okay. Well, accept from me, if you will
11	and it could be subject to check or verification
12	that Dr. Johnson I think in his Table 8 identifies
13	fees attributable to carrying PTV as a distant signal
14	in the amount of \$3.7 million for the year 1998. Does
15	that sound about right?
16	A I don't know. I truly don't know.
17	Q All right. Well, let's take a cable
18	operator with 30,000 subscribers. Okay?
19	A No one said there was going to be a test.
20	Q It's not a test. It's not a test.
21	(Laughter.)
22	It's just a couple of questions.

1	A All right.
2	Q And we've got a license fee on 21 for
3	Nickelodeon of 55 cents a month, right? .55. So it
4	would be 30,000 times .55 times 12, right? 12 months.
5	Right?
6	A I see it.
7	Q That we'll get a year. And I worked that
8	up to \$198,000. Does that sound right?
9	A I'm going to have to trust you. I don't
LO	do math in my head.
.1	Q Now, the \$3.7 million that I identified
.2	that Dr. Johnson quotes as the fees gen, or the
.3	identified fees for 1998 carriage of PTV as a distant
.4	signal, \$3.7 million, right, can be divided by the
.5	subscribers, which you've testified is about six
.6	million, right?
.7	A Yes.
.8	Q So we have PTV, we have six million
.9	divided into \$3.7 million, and we can figure out a
0	yearly fee as well, and that equals, let's see, 62
1	cents. So we'd have to divide that further by 12 to
2	get the per month fee for carriage of PTV as a distant

1	signal, whi	ch is about a nickel. And that's the
2	number that	compares to that, right? Do you follow
3	me?	
4	A	Yes, I'm studying it.
5	Q	Okay.
6	A	Let me just back up a minute.
7	Q	Keep going.
8	A	The 3.7, again, you arrived at that how?
9	Q	That's Dr. Johnson's figure. And I've got
10	to tell you	that we don't agree with it.
11	A	Well, all right.
12	Q	But and we'll deal with that when Dr.
13	Johnson gets	s on the stand tomorrow.
14	A	And it's 3.7 what?
15	Q	Million dollars.
16	A	Oh, 3.7 million.
17	Q	Right.
18		JUDGE GULIN: And the six million is
19	subscribers	for distant signals.
20		THE WITNESS: Correct.
21		JUDGE GULIN: Gotcha.
22		BY MR. TUCCI:

1	Q	And that is from Mr. Fuller's testimony.
2	A	Right.
3	Q	Subscriber
4	A	Well, shouldn't this be reversed?
5	Q	Well, maybe.
6	A	You're dividing the dollars by the
7	thousands of	:
8	Q	Okay. You're right, 3.7 million divided
9	by six milli	on.
10	A	Okay.
11	Q	Equals 62.
12	A	62 cents.
L3	Q	And that's per year, because this
L4	3.7 million	is per year, and your six million is per
L5	year, subscr	iberships for 1998.
L6	A	Okay. All right. I'm following your
L7	math.	
L8	Q	And it goes to 62 cents, and we divide
L9	if we wante	d it expressed as a monthly charge, it
20	would wh	nich is the same way your Exhibit 21
21	expresses th	e subscriberships, right?
22	A	Yes. Okay. So you'd come up with about

1	five cents?
2	Q Correct.
3	A So that should have a zero in front of it.
4	JUDGE GULIN: That's got to be the 3.7
5	divided by the six million.
6	MR. TUCCI: Correct. That's what we just
7	changed that to.
8	JUDGE GULIN: Oh, I'm sorry. The witness
9	has
10	MR. TUCCI: Yes.
11	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.
12	BY MR. TUCCI:
13	Q All right. So we can figure out how much
14	money that involves, like this \$198,000, right? By
15	multiplying our hypothetical 30,000 subscribers,
16	right, times .62 equals 18,600.
17	A On an annual basis.
18	Q Correct. Which this is on an annual
19	basis, isn't it?
20	A Right. Okay.
21	Q Okay. So our hypothetical cable system,
22	if faced with the choice of carrying PTV distantly for

1	its subscribers, for all its subscribers, would incur
2	a royalty fee of \$18,600, and the same hypothetical
3	cable operator, when he's faced with the choice of
4	carrying Nickelodeon, is going to incur a fee of
5	\$198,000. So one is virtually 10 times more expensive
6	than the other.
7	Now, if we look at
8	A Yes.
9	Q Exhibit 34-X, we can look at what the
10	ratings have done from the period 1994 through 1999
11	for the look-alikes and for PBS. And we can look at
12	the trends, right?
13	A Yes, we can.
14	Q Okay. And we took did a little chart
15	here that takes the rating for selected cable networks
16	and we'll call this Demo 9, is that right? PS
17	Demo 9.
18	(Whereupon, the above-referred
19	to document was marked as PS
20	Demo Exhibit No. 9 for
21	identification.)
22	And take a minute to look at it, but I

1	think the numbers are all from 34-X.
2	A So you pulled an excerpt from this table.
3	Q Correct. For certain stations A&E,
4	History & Garden I'm sorry, Home & Garden
5	JUDGE VON KANN: This is what number,
6	Michael? 35-X?
7	MR. TUCCI: No, this is Demo 9.
8	JUDGE VON KANN: Demo 9.
9	BY MR. TUCCI:
10	Q All right. Now, we've pulled from your
11	cable audience report, this 34-X, PS 34-X, the ratings
12	information for the same periods for certain selected
L3	cable networks. Do you see that?
L4	A I do.
L5	Q And we used A&E, House & Garden is it
L6	House & Garden or Home & Garden?
L7	A It's Home & Garden.
L8	Q All right. Home & Garden.
L9	A It's come to be known as HGTV.
20	Q All right. History, TLC, Lifetime, and
21	Toon. Do you see that?
22	A I do.

1	Q Do you agree that those are all look-
2	alikes?
3	A Toon is certainly not. I don't I can't
4	recall what Lifetime runs. TLC, History, HGTV to an
5	extent because we have how-to programs, A&E, yes.
6	Discovery is not in here.
7	Q You're right.
8	A Because they didn't go anywhere.
9	Q Well, actually, it went from .4 to .5,
10	which would be the same as one of them.
11	A You're getting some huge percentage
12	increases, because these things were so ratings
13	were so small to begin with.
14	Q All right. Well, this is what the
15	competitive environment was, isn't it, between 1994
16	and 1999?
17	A Yes, it was.
18	Q And PBS ratings were going down, and cable
19	networks' ratings were going up, the look-alikes were
20	going up, right?
21	A These were, yes.
22	Q And that's despite the fact that it costs,

1	in our example, 10 times as much to carry Nickelodeon
2	as a cable network than it does to carry PTV as a
3	distant signal.
4	A Yes.
5	Q So, I mean
6	A Go ahead.
7	Q I mean, if we factor cost in there
8	A Yes.
9	Q which we probably should, don't you
10	think?
11	A Well, it has to be taken into account. I
12	would say you're showing us with a downward trend. I
13	know that we have wiggled back and forth with that .9
14	and that 1.0, although you don't see it in this one
15	chart.
16	Q Well, the point is, I think on your
17	page 18 you said that subscribers consider the cable
18	look-alikes to be inferior. But what we have here is
19	actual empirical viewing data from your department
20	showing that subscribers are increasingly watching the
21	local ads, right?
22	A They have grown, that's right.

1	Q	And, I mean, they've demanded them,
2	haven't they	Ϋ́?
3	A	I have no idea whether they're demanding
4	them.	
5	Q	Do you know what the penetration of
6	Nickelodeon	is?
7	A	It's high.
8	Q	In the cable network?
9	A	I don't know precisely, but it's high
10	among the ne	etworks.
11	Q	Would it surprise you if it was 94
12	percent?	
13	A	Of what?
14	Q	Cable households.
15	A	Penetration of cable households.
16	Q	Correct.
17	A	No, it wouldn't.
18		JUDGE YOUNG: I'm sorry. Penetration is?
19		MR. TUCCI: How many cable households
20	as a percent	tage of total cable households, how many
21	have availab	ole Nickelodeon. Ninety-four percent have
22	available Ni	ckelodeon have Nickelodeon available to

1	their subscribers.
2	MR. HESTER: What year are you in?
3	MR. TUCCI: '98 and '99. Actually, you
4	can confirm that with NAB Exhibit 5-X, which I'm happy
5	to pass out again. And, actually, I think Mr. Stewart
6	used a page from the Kagan's from which that was taken
7	this morning, but we have another copy if you'd like
8	to see it.
9	THE WITNESS: What you're describing here
10	is the dynamic that's been going on in the
11	broadcasting industry for a couple of decades. You
12	can't help but give up a little audience. All the
13	broadcasters have been a little bit over this period
14	of time because of the increasing number of new
15	channels.
16	These guys have picked up a little because
17	they started from a low point. There has been a kind
18	of leveling process going on.
19	BY MR. TUCCI:
20	Q Well, they're just percentages, right?
21	A Yes.
22	Q I mean, if you go from a one to a two or

1	a .1 to a .2, it's still, you know, a 100 percent
2	increase.
3	A Yes, I know.
4	Q Okay. But, you know
5	JUDGE GULIN: Excuse me. How old are some
6	of these networks? Like A&E, History, Home & Garden.
7	THE WITNESS: Are you asking me?
8	JUDGE GULIN: Yes, sir.
9	THE WITNESS: A&E is one of the older
10	ones. It was I'm recalling that it was a merger of
11	two cable channels around 1980 or '81. I can't
12	remember the names, but this is the name they ended up
13	with.
14	HGTV is one of the newer ones, or H&G as
15	it shows here.
16	JUDGE GULIN: Meaning about when?
17	THE WITNESS: Again, I'm guessing, but
18	it's I think within the past six or eight years.
19	History is also well, you can see that because of
20	their audience starting from scratch.
21	JUDGE GULIN: Right.
22	THE WITNESS: And you know History is a

1	recent channel.
2	JUDGE GULIN: Right.
3	THE WITNESS: In the mid '90s, I believe,
4	when it launched. The Learning Channel I believe is
5	a little older than that, maybe the late '80s.
6	Lifetime I don't recall, and Cartoon I I think is
7	more recent, maybe 10 or 12 years. But I'm really
8	guessing, Judge. I
9	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.
10	THE WITNESS: That's just approximate
11	JUDGE GULIN: It wouldn't be surprising,
12	I guess, then, that something like The History Channel
13	that only came into existence in '95 their ratings
14	would be increasing, assuming they're viable.
15	THE WITNESS: Right. That's right, as
16	their penetration increased and as people discovered
17	them.
18	JUDGE GULIN: By "penetration," you mean
19	more and more cable companies are carrying them?
20	THE WITNESS: Right. Exactly.
21	BY MR. TUCCI:
22	Q The point of why I'm asking all of this,

1	Mr. Fuller, is, I mean, we have empirical evidence.			
2	We don't need studies. We don't need to talk about			
3	what people think they'd do. We know what they do.			
4	We can look and see what they tune in to. We don't			
5	need to look and see try and create or imagine			
6	what's going through a cable operator's mind. We can			
7	see what a cable operator does. In our example			
8	MR. HESTER: Your Honor, could I object?			
9	I think he's really lecturing the witness. I think he			
10	should be asking questions here.			
11	MR. TUCCI: All right. I'd be happy to.			
12	BY MR. TUCCI:			
13	Q I mean, there is empirical evidence that			
14	we can look to, isn't there?			
15	A There's audience data. But that is as			
16	I've said in my testimony, that is not the we			
17	believe the key reason that a cable operator decides			
18	whether to carry a channel or not. It's one that you			
19	shouldn't ignore. I mean, how can you run a business			
20	and leave out the major networks. But cable operators			
21	are looking for variety, they're looking for quality,			
22	they're looking for a menu that will attract			

1	subscribers and hold them. That's our contention.
2	Q Okay. We can look at what they have
3	actually done in the past, too, can't we?
4	A Who?
5	Q Cable operators.
6	A The cable operators.
7	Q We can look at the choices that they have,
8	in fact, made, can't we?
9	A Well, yes.
LO	Q And that's historical, real-world
11	evidence, isn't it?
L2	A Yes, it is, based on their selection of
L3	channels. That's what I'm referring to.
L4	Q And what they pay for it?
L5	A And what they pay, that's true.
L6	MR. TUCCI: I don't have anything further.
L7	JUDGE GULIN: I have a couple of questions
.8	on this. The point I took from your testimony
.9	regarding Exhibit 21 was that because so much money is
20	being paid for these look-alikes it's reflective of
21	the value of your programming of the television
22	THE WITNESS: That was our point, yes,

sir. 1 2 JUDGE GULIN: Okay. It seems to me it's When I look at Exhibit 21, the 3 kind of a mixed baq. only real look-alikes I see on here -- correct me if 4 I'm wrong -- is -- would be The Discovery Channel, The 5 Learning Channel, and Arts & Entertainment. 6 7 THE WITNESS: This selection is, Ι believe, meant to be illustrative. 8 There are some 9 that are not directly related to PBS. There are some that have some programming like we have, for example, 10 Country Music TV. We've had -- I have a program that 11 12 we've had for years called Austin City Limits. Black Entertainment Television, we do have some programming 13 14 addressed to African-Americans, and so forth. 15 JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Well, I'm going to 16 give you the benefit of the doubt and leave those out, 17 because they have very low license fees. 18 THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, that's fine. JUDGE GULIN: Okay. So, really, it's 19 Discovery Channel, The Learning Channel, and Arts & 20 Entertainment, would 21 be the most like public

22

television, is that fair?

1	THE WITNESS: That's right. And
2	Nickelodeon for the daytime service for the
3	children's
4	JUDGE GULIN: Well, I thought we
5	established this morning that Nickelodeon really
6	wasn't a look-alike, because back in '98/'99 there was
7	very little children's education on TV. It was mostly
8	more entertainment-type stuff that maybe would fit
9	more in the public the Program Suppliers group.
10	THE WITNESS: Well, I would have to leave
11	that to your judgment, because they were just starting
12	with their Nick Jr. at that point. That's our direct
13	comparison.
14	JUDGE GULIN: All right. Well, if I look
15	at Discovery Channel, The Learning Channel, and Arts &
16	Entertainment, I look at their license fees for '98,
17	it looks like it's if we average those three, it's
18	somewhere around 25, 26 cents, something like that.
19	So if your point was to compare that to
20	other types of programming that are represented by the
21	claimant groups here, look at something like CNN which
22	is maybe very close to the NAB claimant group, that's

1	about 50 percent higher. Look at, oh, let's see, USA,
2	which maybe is more like Program Suppliers, something
3	like
4	THE WITNESS: TBS would be a good example.
5	JUDGE GULIN: TBS? Well, that's not on
6	here.
7	THE WITNESS: That's not on there.
8	JUDGE GULIN: Yes, it's not on here. But
9	it would seem that the look-alikes are really kind of
10	at the low end of value to the free marketplace. Am
11	I wrong about that?
12	THE WITNESS: They are certainly lower
13	than some of the others.
14	JUDGE GULIN: All right.
15	THE WITNESS: Arts & Entertainment is
16	fairly high. Discovery, fairly high. But I
17	understand what you're saying.
18	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Well, the good news
19	for you is, though and I think you mention this in
20	your testimony if you look at percent increases, it
21	looks like those have done very well compared
22	THE WITNESS: Well, that was our point, it

1	really was, to show that our type of content has is	
2	being increasingly valued in this example, at a fairly	
3	steep rate of increase.	
4	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. And more so even than	
5	ESPN percentage-wise, more so than really just about	
6	anything else in here, I believe. But still, if you	
7	look at relative value today as opposed to increases,	
8	you're kind of on the low end. So it's kind of a	
9	mixed bag.	
10	THE WITNESS: It's lower than some of	
11	them.	
12	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.	
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, certainly.	
14	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.	
15	JUDGE VON KANN: Mr. Garrett, do you have	
16	a question or two?	
17	MR. GARRETT: Just one. I wondered	
18	whether 34-X had been received into evidence.	
19	JUDGE VON KANN: 34-X. No, it hasn't.	
20	MR. TUCCI: We'd ask that it be received	
21	as substantive evidence here.	
22	MR. HESTER: Okay. I don't have an	

1	objection, Your Honor. We have included it as an
2	exhibit.
3	JUDGE VON KANN: All right. It will be
4	received generally. Okay. Thank you.
5	(Whereupon, the above-referred
6	to document, previously marked
7	as PS Exhibit No. 34-X for
8	identification, was received in
9	evidence.)
10	Okay. Sports, I guess?
11	JUDGE GULIN: While Mr. Garrett is setting
12	up, let me ask you another question. It's about your
13	you have a somewhat lengthy discussion beginning on
14	page 20
15	THE WITNESS: Of my testimony?
16	JUDGE GULIN: Yes, sir.
17	THE WITNESS: All right. I have it.
18	JUDGE GULIN: Going on to page 25. It's
19	a significant portion of your testimony, in which you
20	essentially say that viewership doesn't mean anything
21	in terms of relative value to a cable operator.
22	That's pretty much what you were saying, or very

1	little compared to other metrics.	
2	THE WITNESS: Well, let me soften that	
3	just a little.	
4	JUDGE GULIN: I thought you might.	
5	(Laughter.)	
6	THE WITNESS: I said a moment ago that a	
7	cable operator really can't totally ignore audience.	
8	You wouldn't want to leave out the most popular	
9	channels from your offering, so	
10	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.	
11	THE WITNESS: that's really all I have	
12	to say.	
13	JUDGE GULIN: Well, I guess my question	
14	is, given your extensive discussion here about it, if	
15	absolute numbers if ratings and viewership means	
16	relatively little, why would if it does a change	
17	percentage change in viewership mean anything?	
18	THE WITNESS: Well, we were just taking	
19	that as an indicator of value to the cable operator,	
20	that they're willing to pay these increased I don't	
21	think cable operators are dropping these services,	
22	because they're asking more on a cents per subscriber	

1	basis.	
2	JUDGE GULIN: No, I'm not talking about.	
3	THE WITNESS: Oh.	
4	JUDGE GULIN: I'm talking about I think	
5	there's going to be testimony in the proceedings that	
6	the Nielsen numbers have improved drastically for	
7	public television.	
8	THE WITNESS: Oh, I see.	
9	JUDGE GULIN: Do you have an opinion about	
10	whether that means anything? If the absolute numbers	
11	don't mean anything, why does a change in the absolute	
12	numbers mean anything? If you have an opinion.	
13	THE WITNESS: Hmmm. Well, I'm not sure	
14	how I would answer that.	
15	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.	
16	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I	
17	JUDGE GULIN: No, that's fine.	
18	THE WITNESS: I'd want to think about that	
19	a little bit.	
20	JUDGE GULIN: I'll talk to Mr. Johnson	
21	about it.	
22	THE WITNESS: Okay.	

JUDGE YOUNG: One other question I guess. 1 You had talked -- when you were talking about avidity, 2 I think you did this. Mr. Wilson might have as well. 3 4 Sort of commented that one of the interesting and probably unique phenomena associated with public TV is 5 viewers are also contributors. 6 7 THE WITNESS: Right. Yes, I mentioned that as well. 8 9 JUDGE YOUNG: Have you done any research to sort of demonstrate numbers of contributors or in 10 11 any way that links up contributors to people who watch public TV, or of any way that's relevant to this 12 13 concept of loyalty or avidity? THE WITNESS: There is a study that we 14 15 conduct every other year among members, people who 16 have contributed, in which we ask them their opinions 17 of the service that we provide, and we get something of a reading there. But there's really nothing to 18 19 compare it to as far as non-members. You'd need to 20 see the non-members' opinions as well to see if it's 21 that much stronger. I can't recall anything in recent

years on that subject.

22

1	JUDGE YOUNG: Is there anything that tries		
2	to figure out, among the cable subscribers who are		
3	subscribers to cable systems which carry a PBS DSE,		
4	any way of indicating, you know, what percentage of		
5	those kinds of those subscribers actually are		
6	members or contribute?		
7	THE WITNESS: I don't believe we've		
8	conducted a study that gets at that. You're talking		
9	about the proportion of members that get PBS as a		
10	distant signal, or the other way around, or		
11	JUDGE YOUNG: I guess I was talking the		
12	other way around. We've talked about six million		
13	individuals, six million		
14	THE WITNESS: Oh. Oh, right.		
15	JUDGE YOUNG: households get PBS as a		
16	distant signal, and I was wondering whether there's		
17	any way of saying, well, one percent of that are		
18	contributors, two percent, 50 percent, 10 percent		
19	THE WITNESS: Well, unfortunately, I just		
20	don't know. We've not really done anything on that.		
21	JUDGE YOUNG: Do we know how many people		
22	are contributors to PBS?		

1	THE WITNESS: That we know. I know the
2	current figure. It's about 4.6 million, which is
3	about I think about eight percent of our weekly
4	cumulative viewership.
5	JUDGE YOUNG: About eight percent?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, something like that,
7	eight or nine percent.
8	JUDGE YOUNG: When you talk about
9	cumulative viewership, you are also talking about
10	people who would view it as a local signal or
11	THE WITNESS: Yes, it's the total
12	audience. Yes, I don't know just among the distant
13	signal.
14	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
15	THE WITNESS: Sorry, we don't have that.
16	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Thanks.
17	JUDGE VON KANN: Okay. Mr. Garrett?
18	BY MR. GARRETT:
19	Q Good afternoon, Mr. Fuller.
20	A Good afternoon, Mr. Garrett.
21	Q Good to see you again.
22	A Same here.

1	Q Unlike your father, I have never fallen	
2	asleep during a football game.	
3	(Laughter.)	
4	A Actually, it was a baseball game.	
5	(Laughter.)	
6	Q The only thing I've ever fallen asleep	
7	during is my cross examinations.	
8	(Laughter.)	
9	So if anything happens, just kick me.	
10	A Well, I don't think I'll be falling asleep	
11	during your cross.	
12	Q I've got to tell you, Mr. Fuller, I really	
13	like that point up on the board here, and I hesitate	
14	to change anything. I mean, I don't want any of us to	
15	get into trouble here with the math. So let me just	
16	ask you to turn to Exhibit 21. That's your	
17	Exhibit 21.	
18	A Yes, I have it.	
19	Q That's the monthly license fees charged by	
20	selected cable networks, do you see that?	
21	A I do.	
22	Q Those are all top of the rate card	

1	numbers, are	en't they?
2	A	They probably are, yes.
3	Q	In fact, if you look at page 17 of your
4	 written test	timony, it specifically says that they're
5	top of the	rate card, right?
6	A	I stand corrected. Yes, they are. I know
7	they are.	
8	Q	Does anybody pay top of the rate card?
9	A	I don't know. I suppose it's negotiated,
10	that these a	are negotiated.
11	Q	Okay. So if we're going to do the
12	calculations	s, then we really need to do it with the
13	actual licer	se fees, which Kagan also provides, right?
14	A	I don't know if Kagan provides actuals.
15	Q	But we've already had some of those actual
16	fees	
17	A	Oh, okay.
18	Q	presented in this
19	A	Because I thought Kagan used top of the
20	rate card al	lso.
21	Q	He gave both.
22	А	Oh, okay.

here for top of the rate card.
A Right, right.
Q But he also gives the actual license fees.
And even if you substitute the actual license fees,
you come up with the same conclusion; the numbers just
aren't quite as disparate.
A Yes, that's what I would expect. The
trends would be the same.
Q Okay.
A And the trend is our point.
Q Okay. In your judgment, though, in order
to compare the relative values of the programming
involved in this proceeding, it's fair to take a look
at what cable operators are paying for these different
cable networks, correct?
A I'm sorry. Ask that again, please. I
missed a verb or something in there.
Q I'm sorry. It was a long question. I'll
probably make it longer this time, though.
A That's all right. I'll pay closer
A illac's all light. I'll pay closer

1	Q In assessing the relative values of the
2	different programming involved in this proceeding,
3	it's fair, is it not, to take a look at the license
4	fees that cable operators pay for different cable
5	networks?
6	A Well, we've proven that by including it as
7	our exhibit. So the answer is yes.
8	Q Let me also ask you, on Exhibit 34-X,
9	which is now in the record, on the first page
10	A All right. I have it.
11	Q left-hand column, all the way down at
12	the bottom, the last paragraph, do you see where it
13	says, "Sports programming continues to draw the
14	largest audiences to cable"?
15	A Yes, I do.
16	Q That's consistent with your experience?
17	A Yes.
18	Q Okay. And then, on the next page, in the
19	right-hand column, right underneath the household
20	ratings for the different shows, do you see that?
21	Second page, right-hand column, right below the table
22	up at the top.

1	A Okay. There's a paragraph.
2	Q Right. That's what I'm
3	A You're referring to this paragraph.
4	Q Right.
5	A Okay.
6	Q "This coming season, basic cable networks
7	will spend more than \$3 billion on original
8	programming, about 52 percent of their total
9	programming expenses." Do you see that?
10	A I do.
11	Q Do you think those are good numbers?
12	A Those are numbers, I believe, that the
13	author, Beth Walsh, got from the trade press. So
14	we're dependent upon them for accuracy.
15	Q Okay.
16	A So I have to accept it at that level as
17	probably good.
18	Q Do you know where she, in particular,
19	might have obtained that data?
20	A No, I don't.
21	Q Okay. And when we talk about this coming
22	season, we're talking about 1999 to 2000, or 1998 to

1	199?
2	A Hmmm.
3	JUDGE VON KANN: It may help you to note
4	on the front page that the report was compiled
5	December 30, 1999.
6	THE WITNESS: It is. It's just a peculiar
7	choice of words. I'm not sure why she said that,
8	because it's a little early in the season to be
9	talking about next season, in December. And I'm not
10	quite sure what she's referring to.
11	BY MR. GARRETT:
12	Q It's probably in the general timeframe of
13	1999/2000, is that right?
14	A Yes, somewhere in there. But she also
15	could have been talking about the current season as
16	well. So it's in that ball park.
17	Q Okay. All right. Mr. Fuller, you are the
18	John W. Fuller who testified in the 1990 to '92 cable
19	royalty distribution proceeding, are you not?
20	A Yes, I am.
21	Q And you submitted written testimony as
22	well as oral testimony in that proceeding?

1	A Yes, I did.
2	Q Okay. Let me just hand you a copy of a
3	document that we'll mark as JSC Demo Number 16, which
4	is a complete copy of your written testimony in the
5	'90 to '92 proceeding.
6	(Whereupon, the above-referred
7	to document was marked as JSC
8	Demo Exhibit No. 16 for
9	identification.)
10	Do you recognize the document, Mr. Fuller?
11	A Yes, I do.
12	Q And this was your testimony in that prior
13	proceeding?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Let me just have you turn, if you would,
16	to the bullet points that begin on page 2.
17	A All right.
18	Q These bullet points were intended to
19	summarize the written testimony, correct?
20	A That's right.
21	Q And let me direct well, Judge Young had
22	asked you a question about the number of U.S.

1	households that had children under the age of 12 in
2	the 1990 to '92 period. Do you recall that?
3	A I do recall that.
4	Q And I believe that you were unable to
5	recall a specific number when that question was asked.
6	Is that correct?
7	A That's correct.
8	Q Let me just direct your attention to the
9	fourth bullet there on page 2. Do you see that?
10	A I do.
11	Q Okay. There you state that more than a
12	third of U.S. households have children under the age
13	of 10, do you see that?
14	A Under 12.
15	Q Under the age of 12, correct?
16	A I do see that.
17	Q All right. And the number that you've
18	used for the '98 to '99 period is about 28 percent,
19	correct?
20	A That's right.
21	Q Do you have any reason to believe that
22	either of those numbers is incorrect?
1	

1	A No.
2	Q Would it be fair to conclude from your
3	testimony that the number or the percentage of
4	households in the United States who would have an
5	interest in children's programming was somewhat less
6	in 1998 to '99 than it was in 1990 to '92?
7	A A little less.
8	Q The difference between over a third and 28
9	percent.
10	A Yes, it might be four percentage points.
11	Q Okay.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: Isn't that five percent?
13	THE WITNESS: I don't know what the actual
14	number is, though.
15	JUDGE YOUNG: And what is 33 percent as
16	opposed to 28 percent?
17	THE WITNESS: Well, I was thinking 34.
18	Oh, I'm sorry six.
19	JUDGE YOUNG: Six percent.
20	THE WITNESS: Six. I'm sorry. Yes. So
21	the gap would be about six points, maybe seven.
22	BY MR. GARRETT:

1	Q Okay. Now, as I look at the bullet points
2	in your current testimony, which also begin on page 2,
3	do you see that?
4	A Of my current testimony?
5	Q Yes.
6	A Okay. I'm still in the old one.
7	Q Yes. If you just put the two of those
8	together, the '98 to '99 on the one hand, and the '90
9	to '92 on the other hand, do you see that?
10	A I'm drowning in paper. Just a moment.
11	Okay. What page of my current testimony?
12	Q Page 2. And your former testimony,
13	page
14	A All right. I have them.
15	Q Would I be correct in saying that with one
16	exception all of the points that you make here on
17	page 2 are points that you had made in your prior
18	testimony?
19	A You're asking me whether I agree with that
20	or not?
21	Q Yes.
22	A Unless I read all of what I wrote before,

Τ	can't really answer that, Mr. Garrett.
2	Q Okay.
3	A Because it continues on to the next page,
4	and I don't know if they are, and I don't remember
5	that you know, that far back.
6	Q Okay. One thing that is different about
7	the testimony this time than the last time is the
8	reference to the PBS study, correct? Do you recall?
9	A Well, I haven't looked at this in a long
10	time, and I don't remember what I said about do you
11	mean my reference to the PBS study in the present
12	case?
13	Q Yes.
14	A And as opposed to mentioning it before
15	or
16	Q That's right.
17	A not mentioning it, as the case may be.
18	Q Yes. You didn't mention it in the last
19	testimony.
20	A I did mention it?
21	Q You did not.
22	A Did not. Thank you. I'm sorry.
- 1	

1	Q Do I need to be sworn in here?
2	(Laughter.)
3	The only point I wanted to make about that
4	is is that, in fact, that study was available in the
5	last proceeding, and PBS and all the other parties who
6	were interested in that study did rely upon it, did
7	they not?
8	A I don't recall whether we did or not in
9	the
10	Q Do you know how the Arbitrators treated
11	that study in the last proceeding?
12	A No, I don't.
13	Q Okay. So you're not here suggesting that
14	they treat that this Arbitration Panel treat it any
15	differently than it was treated the last time around?
16	A I don't know how they treated it last
17	time.
18	Q Okay.
19	A So
20	Q That's fine. Also, as I compare the two
21	summaries, I guess one other difference is is that you
22	discussed the Bortz study the last time and not this
1	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

1	time, correct?
2	A That's correct.
3	Q I'll have marked as JSC Exhibit 24-X a
4	document that we received from PBS in discovery.
5	(Whereupon, the above-referred
6	to document was marked as JSC
7	Exhibit No. 24-X for
8	identification.)
9	JUDGE GULIN: You're not finished with
LO	Demo 16, are you?
L1	MR. GARRETT: No. I actually was going to
L2	ask other questions, but go ahead, if you have a
L3	question.
.4	JUDGE GULIN: And you may have just been
.5	getting into this I'm not sure you talk when
.6	you talk about Bortz first of all, has this been
.7	designated, this testimony, by
.8	MR. GARRETT: I'm sure that we designated
.9	it, and I believe that PBS has noted it as well. I'm
20	not certain about that.
21	MR. HESTER: I can check, Your Honor.
22	JUDGE VON KANN: Are you planning to come

1	back to this in some way a little bit later in the
2	testimony?
3	MR. GARRETT: I did have some other
4	questions at some point in time. But as I say, go
5	ahead.
6	MR. HESTER: It is designated in our as
7	part of our case as something we incorporated in the
8	prior proceeding.
9	JUDGE GULIN: I'll tell you what. You go
10	ahead and ask your questions, Mr. Garrett, and I'll
11	see what you ask him and then
12	MR. GARRETT: I guess now I'm on the hook
L3	to ask him some questions about this.
L4	(Laughter.)
L5	JUDGE VON KANN: Right.
L6	BY MR. GARRETT:
L7	Q First, I wanted to talk about 24-X. It
L8	bears the Bates Stamp Numbers of PTV 002566, 2567, and
L9	then it's 002081 through 2092. And I believe it's all
20	one document, but we received it at different times
21	from PBS. Are you familiar with this document, Mr.
22	Fuller?

1	A I'm familiar with some '98 and '99
2	documents. I don't think I've seen these '97s.
3	Q Well
4	A And I have seen the '92.
5	Q Let me just tell you my understanding, and
6	you correct me if I'm wrong. As I understand it, this
7	is a printout that was generated by Cable Data
8	Corporation, is that right?
9	A That's right.
10	Q And it was generated for PBS?
11	A That's right.
12	Q And it was generated for PBS in connection
13	with this particular proceeding, correct?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And the data in here are data that
16	underlie various statements by you, and I think also
17	Dr. Johnson, concerning the carriage of public
18	television signals?
19	A That's correct.
20	Q And as I understand it, if we go to the
21	first line here, it says zero fully distant and zero
22	partially distant and one local, do you see that?

1	A I do.
2	Q My understanding of that is that means
3	that this is the number of cable systems that had no
4	distant educational stations, no partially distant
5	educational stations, and one local educational
6	station during the second accounting period of 1992.
7	A Yes, that's my understanding as well.
8	Q Okay. And so what this would show is that
9	there were, during that accounting period, 1,002 cable
LO	systems that had no distant, no partially distant, but
11	one local educational station, correct?
L2	A Yes.
L3	Q And you had some conversations with the
L4	Panel early on today about the numbers of cable
L5	systems that fell within different categories, do you
L6	recall that?
L7	A Yes.
.8	Q Okay. As I understand it, if I look at
.9	the second column, it says Total Unique Subscribers,
20	do you see that?
21	A I do.
22	Q And that would show the number of unique

1	subscribers to those 1,002 cable systems, correct?
2	A That's right.
3	Q And the next column says Distant
4	Subscriber Instances Adjusted, do you see that?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And we see a zero there because there, in
7	fact, were no distant signals carried by those 1,002
8	I'm sorry, no distant educational signals
9	A Correct.
10	Q carried by those 1,002 cable systems,
11	right?
12	A Yes.
13	Q So if we wanted to determine, for example,
14	the number of educational the number of cable
15	systems that carried distant educational stations for
16	any particular accounting period, we could do that
17	from these data, right?
18	A Yes, that's right.
19	Q Now, let me ask you to turn to your
20	Exhibit 15.
21	A All right. I have it.
22	Q Just hold that there. Incidentally, what
,	

1	is your understanding of the term "partially distant"
2	as used in this printout here?
3	A Well, it's a situation where part of the
4	subscribers to a given system are in a distant zone
5	with respect to a particular station. Not all of them
6	are distant, but part of them are, based on whatever
7	the rule is about coverage.
8	Q Is it a situation where the particular
9	signal would be distant in one portion of the cable
10	system and local in the other portion of the cable
11	system?
12	A That's right. Yes, that's
13	Q And the portion where it was local, it
14	would be a must carry, correct?
15	A Now, I don't know the must carry rules
16	very well. I can't answer that affirmatively. I just
17	don't know.
18	Q All right. So you're not familiar with
19	the must carry rules at all?
20	A No, I'm really not.
21	Q And you don't know how they would affect
22	carriage patterns of particular cable systems and the
1	I and the second

1	distant signals that they carry?
2	A No. No, I'm sorry.
3	Q Okay. Now, in Exhibit 15, you discussed
4	earlier in your testimony today you talked about
5	how the number of cable systems that carried distant
6	educational stations had increased from 1992, correct?
7	A Yes, I did say that.
8	Q All right. If you look at Exhibit 15, we
9	see, for example, in 92-2 there were 473 cable systems
10	that carried one or more distant educational stations,
11	right?
12	A That's right.
13	Q And then, 514 during the second accounting
14	period of 1998, correct?
15	A Right. And then it jumped again up to
16	534.
17	Q Right. Now, if we broke these numbers
18	down between cable systems that carried only fully
19	distant signals as opposed to any partially distant
20	signals, do you know what the numbers would be?
21	A Are you talking about systems or
22	subscribers?

1	Q	I'm just looking at the column here that
2	says	
3	A	Just
4	Q	total systems with distant
5	retransmiss	ions.
6	A	Yes, I don't know the number of systems.
7	Q	Okay.
8	A	In this chart.
9	Q	But we would be able to calculate that
10	number, wou	ld we not, by going to
11	A	Yes.
12	Q	JSC Exhibit Number 24-X?
13	A	Yes.
14	Q	All right.
15	A	I'm sorry. JSC 24-X? Which is the one
16	that's this	one.
17	Q	That's the one
18	A	Yes. Yes, you could.
19	Q	Okay. And let me just represent to you
20	that we've	done some very quick calculations that
21	would all b	e subject to check, but it shows that in
22	92-2 there w	vere 395 Form 3 systems that carried one or

more educational stations on a fully, not partially,
distant basis.
A All right.
Q Okay?
JUDGE VON KANN: What was that number?
MR. GARRETT: 395.
BY MR. GARRETT:
Q And that in 1998-2, that number had
actually decreased to 370. And then, in 99-2, it went
up, but not to its '92 level, to 389. Would that be
consistent with your understanding, Mr. Fuller, that
when we see increases here in cable systems carrying
distant educational stations, those increases were
from partially distant carriage as opposed to fully
distant signals?
A It looks like most of it, therefore, would
be from partially distant systems.
Q Okay.
A Most of the increase.
Q All right. And, again, you're not
familiar with the must carry rules and how they might
have impacted the carriage patterns of distant

1	educational stations.
2	A No, I'm not really.
3	Q Okay. And, again, I guess if we wanted to
4	have it for the full record, we could do these same
5	calculations for all of the different periods that are
6	reflected here in JSC Exhibit Number 24-X, right?
7	A Right.
8	Q Let me ask you about one other
9	calculation. We've talked a little bit about the
10	number of Form 3 cable systems that had no local
11	signals, no local educational stations, right?
12	A I'm sorry. Ask that one more time.
13	Q Well, it didn't come out quite right. Let
14	me ask it this way.
15	MR. GARRETT: Do you want to keep going
16	here?
17	JUDGE VON KANN: I was sort of thinking
18	3:30, but if you're at a good place and you'd like to
19	do it now, that's fine. I don't care much.
20	MR. GARRETT: This next little part will
21	probably go longer than
22	JUDGE VON KANN: It will take a while?

Т	All right. Why don't we take a 15-minute break, come
2	back at 3:40 here.
3	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
4	foregoing matter went off the record at
5	3:26 p.m. and went back on the record at
6	3:52 p.m.)
7	MR. GARRETT: Let me just take care of a
8	couple of housekeeping matters. First of all, I'd
9	like to move the admission of 24-X for substantive
10	purposes.
11	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Hester?
12	MR. HESTER: We have no objection to that,
13	Your Honor.
14	JUDGE von KANN: All right. So received.
15	(Whereupon, the above-referred
16	to document, previously marked
17	as JSC Exhibit No. 24-X for
18	identification, was admitted
19	into evidence.)
20	MR. GARRETT: Secondly, I have distributed
21	to the Panel and all counsel a document that has been
22	marked as JSC 25-X.

(Whereupon, the above-referred 1 to document was marked as 2 JSC Exhibit No. 25-X for 3 identification.) 4 It is exactly -- well, it's MR. GARRETT: 5 exactly the same format as 24-X except that it has one 6 7 additional column of information, which is the total royalties paid by the cable systems in each of these 8 9 different categories. It also differs in the sense 10 it was run for JSC as opposed to 11 Television and it was run recently as compared to 24-X 12 which was run obviously several months ago. And I'll 13 have some questions on it. I've asked counsel in the interim here whether he would agree to allow that one 14 15 in as well for substantive purposes even though it has a different column of information -- an additional 16 17 column of information, I should say. 18 JUDGE von KANN: Let's take the questions 19 and then find out where we are at the end of that, 20 unless you -- you do have questions about it? I was going to use some of 21 MR. GARRETT: the data in there. 22

1	JUDGE von KANN: In questioning the
2	Witness.
3	MR. GARRETT: Yes.
4	JUDGE von KANN: Well, let's do that, and
5	then we'll see what Mr. Hester's position is.
6	MR. GARRETT: Okay. I've also distributed
7	just to save time here JSC Demo Number 17, which is
8	actually PTV Exhibit 15 from the I'm sorry, PTV
9	Exhibit Number 24 from the 1992 proceeding.
10	(Whereupon, the above-referred
11	to document was marked as
12	JSC Demo 17 for identification.)
13	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
14	BY MR. GARRETT:
15	Q All right. Mr. Fuller, you talk in your
16	'98-'99 testimony as well as the '90 to '92 testimony
17	about the two broad classes of cable operators: Those
18	who have no public television signal available locally
19	and those who do, correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And you give us some data about each of
22	those categories.

1	A Right. Right.
2	Q I'm going to just put up here a chart to
3	reflect those categories and call it cable systems
4	with distant public television, okay?
5	A Yes, I see it.
6	Q And then one category, I'll just call it
7	Category A, has zero local PTV, okay?
8	A Okay.
9	Q And the second category will have one or
10	more local PTV, okay?
11	A All right.
12	Q Now, you talk about the very significant
13	value that distant public television signals have to
14	cable operators in Category A, correct?
15	A Right, because that's the only public
16	television signal they have.
17	Q Right. And you also talk about the value
18	that a distant public television station would have to
19	cable operators in Category B, correct?
20	A That's right, I do.
21	Q Okay. Would you agree that the cable
22	operators in Category A would place the greatest value

1	on distant public television signals between these two
2	categories?
3	A Well, it's guessing, but I would say
4	logically probably many or most of them do, yes.
5	Q And that's because they don't have any
6	local public television. The only
7	A That's right.
8	Q way they're getting
9	A Is by distant.
LO	Q Okay. And if you were trying to sell one
L1	of these signals to a cable operator, you would come
L2	in and pitch it as saying, "I'm going to give you
L3	something that you don't have locally," right?
.4	A Of course.
L5	Q And with Category B, the pitch would be,
.6	"Well, I may be giving you some programs that are
17	duplicative but they are on at different times of the
.8	day. I'm giving you some new programs that you might
.9	have on the local signal," right?
20	A That's right. You have it exactly right.
21	Q You know, after 20 years, I would know.
2	A Thank you

1	Q I've heard it several times.
2	A for stating my case.
3	Q But as a general matter, those cable
4	operators in Category A are going to value your
5	signals greater than those who are in Category B.
6	A As a general matter, yes.
7	Q Okay. Now, if I look at the 1990 to '92
8	period and I focus in particular on your Exhibit I
9	guess it's 24, which is JSC Demo 17
10	A Okay. I have it.
11	Q the percentage of Form 3 cable
12	operators who would fall within that Category A would
13	be 52.6 percent, correct?
14	A Yes.
15	Q And, conversely, the percentage that would
16	fall within Category B would be 47.4 percent, correct?
17	A That's right.
18	Q And those are the numbers that are shown
19	either directly or by implication there on your
20	Exhibit 24.
21	A Right. Right.
22	Q Right?

the
ory
•
ery
awc
ble
ons
. I
out
e I
90-
of
es,
I
li de

1	Q All right.
2	A Is there a page that I should refer to?
3	Q Yes. Let's look, first of all, at '98 to
4	'99, and we go to Page 2, your first bullet point,
5	which I believe was a corrected number. Isn't that
6	3.6 percent of
7	A Yes, it is. That's correct.
8	Q Okay. Now, we're looking at the cable
9	subscribers for '98 to '99, you're showing these
10	numbers are not going to be comparable, and I don't
11	mean to suggest that they are, but it's 3.6 percent of
12	all distant subscribers would be getting a distant
13	public television signal where there is no local
14	public television signal, correct?
15	A Yes, that's right.
16	Q Okay. And for the other Category B, the
17	number would be 6.7 percent, correct?
18	A That's right. That's the percent of total
19	cable subscribers.
20	Q Right.
21	A Right.
22	Q And then we want to get the comparable

1	numbers from '90 to '92 we could go to your testimony
2	from '90 to '92, Page 2
3	A Third bullet.
4	Q Right. And the Category A subscribers
5	would be 4.6 percent?
6	A That's correct. And Category B is 5.7
7	percent.
8	Q So what we see is that those in Category
9	A have declined somewhat in the '90 to '92 period,
10	correct, their percentage, I guess?
11	A Yes. There's a one percentage point shift
12	that went from Category A to Category B. These
13	increased.
14	Q Right. Right. Thank you. Now, if I turn
15	to Exhibit 25-X that we had marked, and we could
16	determine from that the total number of cable systems
17	that carried distant public television signals that
18	had no local public television signals available,
L9	correct?
20	A That's right.
21	Q And the way we would do that is we would
22	go down that first column looking for all the places

1	where all the lines where we saw zero local,
2	correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And tally that up. I've done that
5	quickly, and, again, subject to check, but it appears
6	that at least in 98-2 there were about 255 cable
7	systems that carried one or more distant public
8	television stations and had no local public television
9	stations available. Does that number sound about
10	right to you?
11	A I haven't done that exercise, Mr. Garrett.
12	So you say 255 by your addition
13	Q Yes.
14	A of all of those that carried a distant
15	public station but no local.
16	Q That's correct. And it could be carried
17	distant either on a partial basis or on a
18	A Okay.
19	Q All right. You haven't done the
20	calculation so you can't tell me whether or not it's
21	right around
22	A No.

1	Q but we could make that calculation from
2	this document here.
3	A Yes, you can from this.
4	Q And we could also determine from both 24-X
5	and 25-X the number of subscribers to those systems
6	that had no local public television signals but did
7	have distant public television signals, correct?
8	A Yes.
9	Q And we could determine but only from 25-X
10	the amount of royalties, the total royalties that
11	those systems paid, correct?
12	A That's what this says, yes.
13	Q Okay. I guess I could say at this point
14	I would move 25-X for substantive purposes.
15	MR. HESTER: Well, Your Honor, I would
16	object to that for two reasons. First, 25-X is not a
17	document that underlies Mr. Fuller's testimony, and we
18	did not produce it for that purpose. More
19	importantly, these royalty numbers are subject to a
20	lot of assumptions because of the difficulties
21	presented by the minimum royalty payments that all
22	Form 3 systems have to make. And if you've had a

1	chance to look at Dr. Johnson's testimony, for
2	instance, he discussed very wide variation in the
3	amount of fees that would be attributed to distant
4	signal carriage of PBS based on different assumptions
5	that would be made about what royalties go into which
6	pot. So I think Mr. Fuller is not properly a
7	sponsoring witness for the royalty column, which is
8	the only additional information in 25-X and it's not
9	simple.
10	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
11	MR. GARRETT: Sorry.
12	JUDGE von KANN: No, go ahead.
13	MR. GARRETT: Go ahead? I want to say I
14	agree, in part, with Mr. Hester, and I disagree, in
15	part, with Mr. Hester. I agree with him that I think
16	that under the procedure we're following here that it
17	should be admitted for just impeachment purposes and
18	not as a substantive document. That's one.
19	Two, I believe Mr. Hester misunderstands
20	the information that I've given here and it's my fault
21	for not being clear. We have not tried to assign
22	royalties to any particular category of signal, which

is I think the concern that Mr. Hester has. This is the total amount of royalties paid by the total number of cable systems in this particular column. In much the same way as he has total number of subscribers we've just said, these systems have this total amount of royalties, and this is not an attempt to generate or to show fee generation that has been used in this proceeding.

And the third point I would say is, look, he could be right on impeachment versus substantive, but these are data that are taken directly from a common data source here. We have not manipulated that in any way. We have simply put one more column of information that is, we think, important for the Panel to have in deciding this case. And I would ask again, I made this offer earlier, that parties stipulate to those kinds of numbers, subject to check from Mr. Larson, but I think it's important to have that kind of data in the record.

JUDGE von KANN: I think I heard you say at the beginning of that that you're offering it for impeachment at this stage?

No, I was offering it for MR. GARRETT: 1 substantive purposes, and, again, giving Mr. Hester 2 the opportunity to check the data and put in what --3 we can argue about the relevance of the data as we go 4 on, but I don't think there should be any question 5 about the data. They've given three columns of 6 7 information, I've just given the fourth. 8 JUDGE von KANN: We'll receive at this 9 point for impeachment purposes. Obviously, if you 10 think it's important for us to have that, you can put it on in rebuttal. And you're right, this issue has 11 12 from time to time about the 13 stipulating some of this data, but at this point it 14 hasn't been resolved to my knowledge, and we're not 15 forcing that on anybody at this juncture. So we'll 16 receive it for impeachment purposes. 17 MR. GARRETT: Okay. (Whereupon, the above-referred 18 19 to document, previously marked 20 as JSC Exhibit No. 25-X for

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

identification,

into evidence.)

21

22

admitted

was

MR. GARRETT: I think I am done now with the '90 to '92 testimony, Judge Gulin. You said you have a question.

JUDGE GULIN: Mr. Fuller, I'd like to ask a couple questions about what's been marked as JSC Demo 16, your testimony from the 1992 proceeding, if you could get a hold of that.

THE WITNESS: I have it.

I know I'm testing your JUDGE GULIN: memory a little bit here but I think that some of the matters you brought up then could be very instructive to the Panel for this proceeding even though you didn't discuss it in your testimony this time. 4, I think, 4 through about 7, you talk about what you think you were some appropriate adjustments that should have been made. I don't know if they were made, I don't remember the final decision in the '92 decision that well, but you talk about a couple of adjustments that needed to be made with respect to PBS, Public Television Share, under the Bortz study. And the first one I want to ask you about is actually discussed at the bottom of Page 5. Could you just

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1.0

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	read a little bit of that to yourself to refamiliarize
2	yourself with it, please.
3	THE WITNESS: All right, I am. The
4	paragraph beginning with, "Because PBS?"
5	JUDGE GULIN: Yes, sir.
6	THE WITNESS: All right.
7	JUDGE GULIN: Let me know when you're
8	finished that.
9	THE WITNESS: All right. All right, I'm
10	finished.
11	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Your point here is
12	that an adjustment should be made to the Bortz to
13	the PBS Bortz share because PBS only is permitted to
14	participate in the Basic Fund and not the 3.75 Fund.
15	That's basically your point here, correct?
16	THE WITNESS: That's right.
17	JUDGE GULIN: Now, I assume, first of all,
18	that Public Television is unique in this proceeding in
19	that it's the only claimant group that cannot
20	participate in the 3.75 Fund.
21	THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
22	JUDGE GULIN: You don't know if that's

1	true or not.
2	THE WITNESS: I really don't know.
3	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Well, I recall the
4	cross examination Mr. Dove conducted of Dr. Rosston.
5	Do you know who he is?
6	THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
7	JUDGE GULIN: All right. He sponsored the
8	regression analysis, which you may or may not be
9	familiar in this proceeding.
10	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm sorry, I don't.
11	JUDGE GULIN: It doesn't really I'm
12	sorry, it doesn't matter.
13	THE WITNESS: Okay.
14	JUDGE GULIN: But he made the same point
15	with respect to the regression analysis, that because
16	PBS does not participate in the 3.75 Fund, some of an
17	adjustment would be made, and he went through a
18	calculation. And Dr. Rosston had proceeded to agree
19	with him that that would be appropriate. Now, that
20	was with respect to this other type of analysis that
21	was new this year. Here we're talking about Bortz,

which is also part of this proceeding, and I read

1	through your testimony, it's the first time I've seen
2	it, and I'm having a little trouble understanding it,
3	frankly, as to why you think there should be an
4	adjustment to Bortz because they don't participate in
5	the 3.75 Fund, Public Television. Can you explain
6	that to us?
7	THE WITNESS: Well, it wasn't that so
8	much. I really am not that familiar I don't recall
9	whether the 3.75 Fund is even still applicable today
10	or in '98-'99. I'm just not that up to speed on that
11	subject. Our concern in the Bortz study is some of
12	the methodology or the
13	JUDGE GULIN: That's all right. I don't
14	want to get into that.
15	THE WITNESS: Okay. Okay.
16	JUDGE GULIN: I just wanted to know if you
17	remembered your argument with respect to this
18	particular adjustment, t he 3.75 Fund.
19	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I just don't.
20	JUDGE GULIN: Okay,.
21	THE WITNESS: It's been too long.
22	JUDGE GULIN: And I guess you also don't
- 1	

1	recall, I would guess, whether the librarian accepted
2	that argument or not.
3	THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
4	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Fair enough. There
5	was another adjustment and that's on the bottom of
6	Page 4, beginning on the last paragraph, "As discussed
7	in the testimony of Dr. William Fairley."
8	THE WITNESS: You're in my earlier
9	testimony now, correct
10	JUDGE GULIN: Yes.
11	THE WITNESS: Okay. Page 4?
12	JUDGE GULIN: Yes.
13	THE WITNESS: All right. I have it. Oh,
14	yes.
15	JUDGE GULIN: Do you remember that
16	argument?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes. That's a similar one
18	we have now.
19	JUDGE GULIN: Yes. I remember Mr.
20	Hester's cross examination in this regard of one of
21	the Sports witnesses in making a similar argument. I
22	guess what got me a little confused was I thought the

1	testimony was during that cross examination and the
2	prior proceeding none of the cable operators none
3	of the PBS programming was automatically assigned a
4	zero. They were automatically assigned a zero, but
5	none of them happened to be in the sample. Am I
6	confused about that?
7	MR. HESTER: Should I clarify it?
8	JUDGE GULIN: Yes. I would appreciate it.
9	MR. HESTER: And Mr. Garrett should jump
10	in.
11	MR. GARRETT: I will.
12	MR. HESTER: There were two issues I
13	discussed with Dr. Trautman. One was this automatic
14	zero adjustment when a system did not carry a public
15	television distant signal it was automatically given
16	a zero. That's the issue discussed here in Mr.
17	Fuller's prior testimony.
18	The point that we were pressing as a new
19	feature this time, although in fairness Dr. Trautman
20	said it was part of his method before but it hadn't
21	been presented in the data previously until this
22	proceeding, was the exclusion from the sample of a

1	system that only carried a PTV signal, and that was
2	the point that was different in the data, as Dr.
3	Trautman said, not in the method but in the data.
4	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. I got you now. So
5	the same issue, I guess, is applicable this time.
6	MR. HESTER: Yes.
7	JUDGE GULIN: Well, I've got you
8	testifying, what happened with respect to this other
9	argument that I mentioned before. Was that accepted
10	or rejected by the librarian?
11	MR. HESTER: The 3.75 adjustment was not
12	accepted by the Panel.
13	JUDGE GULIN: Okay.
14	MR. HESTER: The automatic zero was. But
15	this is something that Dr. Johnson is going to
16	discuss. Frankly, we haven't done as much with the
17	Bortz study in our direct case because we didn't have
18	the results
19	JUDGE GULIN: Yes, I understand.
20	MR. HESTER: at the time we submitted
21	our direct case this time through.
22	JUDGE GULIN: All right. Thank you.

JUDGE von KANN: Your point on the -- I 1 don't want to take a lot of time, but your point on 2 this 3.5 business is that the Bortz number purports to 3 be an overall share of the royalty. 4 5 THE WITNESS: Yes. And if that were only JUDGE von KANN: 6 7 applied to the part of the Royalty Fund, that is the 8 Basic Fund, that you participate in, you wouldn't get 9 to that number for the total, because you wouldn't be 10 participating in the Basic side. 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. Exactly right. It was 12 an argument that frankly was not -- I think it was 13 misunderstood, I mean in our view. I mean people can -- in our view, it was perceived as an adjustment to 14 15 the Bortz results, and our point was it wasn't an 16 adjustment to the Bortz results, it 17 application, what you did with the survey results. weren't adjusting the study. 18 19 JUDGE GULIN: Well, I don't understand it, 20 so I hope you'll -- I understand how it applies to the 21 regression analysis, but I just don't understand why

it would apply to the Bortz analysis.

	1
1	MR. HESTER: Okay.
2	JUDGE GULIN: You'll educate me at some
3	point.
4	MR. HESTER: Yes. And I think Dr. Johnson
5	will be able to speak to that, and it's certainly
6	something we understand we have to come in our
7	rebuttal case on that issue.
8	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. All right.
9	MR. GARRETT: If I could just add, Mr.
10	Hester points out it was that adjustment, the one we
11	were just talking about was dealt with by the
12	arbitrators on Pages 120 and 1124 of the CARP report.
13	One-twenty describes the argument and 124 rejects it,
14	and I believe, but Mr. Hester will correct me if I'm
15	wrong, that that was one of the issues that was
16	assigned on appeal to the librarian. Is that not
17	correct? I think that the librarian ruled on that as
18	well.
19	JUDGE GULIN: And upheld the Panel?
20	MR. GARRETT: Upheld the Panel on that
21	one. And with respect to the other argument that
22	adjustment describes, that also was discussed in the

1	CARP report, and the CARP said in that particular
2	case, and we've given you the pages on this earlier,
3	basically said that since nobody had seemed to oppose
4	it in that proceeding, that they were going to accept
5	it, and that was the source of the six percent numbers
6	that the arbitrators had put in their report.
7	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. I apologize for
8	getting into this kind of oral argument, but
9	occasionally there's something just gnawing at me that
10	I have to get rid of, and I don't want to wait till
11	the end of proceeding before I understand it.
12	MR. GARRETT: I hope you've gotten rid of
13	it.
14	(Laughter.)
15	JUDGE YOUNG: Well, I'm going to test Mr.
16	Garrett's knowledge of the CARP report and just ask
17	him what did the Panel do and where is it with respect
18	to this Sieber survey or anyone else?
19	MR. GARRETT: It was discussed it was
20	something that I know PBS relied upon in their
21	proposed findings in the case, and I believe NAB did
22	and the Program Suppliers as well. I think we all
į.	

1	ended up discussing it, but I don't recall
2	JUDGE YOUNG: You know, I don't mean to
3	put everybody through this. I'll look for it later.
4	I just thought if someone knew offhand. Did the Panel
5	credit it?
6	MR. GARRETT: I think the Panel took it
7	into consideration. I mean it was never offered as a
8	bottom-line analysis as such, so people just took out
9	of the survey whatever they thought would be useful to
10	their case, and it was cited to the Panel, but I don't
11	think it ever had any well, I shouldn't say, no; we
12	should read it.
13	MR. HESTER: I mean Mr. Garrett's right
14	that we cited it in findings, but we did not present
15	it the way we presented it this time.
16	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. I'll look for it.
17	Thanks.
18	MR. HESTER: It is oh, yes, I see, it's
19	33 to 34.
20	JUDGE YOUNG: Well, I see he I was,
21	generally, the Panel described it. I was looking for
22	the analysis.
	1

1	MR. STEWART: Page 42 is where they would
2	have addressed it, 42, 43 and 44. And they don't
3	appear to have resolved it at that point.
4	JUDGE YOUNG: Did not resolve it.
5	MR. STEWART: Correct. Didn't address it
6	in 1999 determination, final observation.
7	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay. Let's go back to the
8	testimony. Unless Judge von Kann wants
9	JUDGE von KANN: No. No.
10	BY MR. GARRETT:
11	Q Mr. Fuller, let me just direct your
12	attention to your '98-'99 testimony here on Page 3.
13	A All right.
14	Q You say here the retransmission of a
15	distant public television signal is vitally important
16	to cable operators that do not have a local public
17	television signal to offer to their subscribers,
18	correct?
19	A Correct.
20	Q And that's what we were discussing a few
21	minutes ago.
22	A Right here on the board.

1	Q Okay. Would you agree that it's vitally
2	important to cable operators that don't have access to
3	a local Fox signal to offer that signal to its
4	subscribers?
5	A I don't know how I could answer that, Mr.
6	Garrett. I don't know. I know how much people value
7	our service, and I'm pretty sure the cable operators
8	do too because of the nature of our content. And I'm
9	not that familiar with Fox. Fox I think provides only
10	a fairly small portion of a day's program schedule, so
11	the rest of it would be up to the station itself to
12	fill. So I'm not sure I could answer that one way or
13	the other.
L4	Q All right. You can't help us compare
L5	public television with programming on Fox, I take it.
L6	A I wouldn't want to. Sorry.
L7	Q You did testify earlier that cable
L8	networks would want to broadcast networks, they want
ا 9	to be able to carry the broadcast networks?
20	A Yes.
21	Q But were you not including Fox within that
22	category?
i	

1	A All right. In fairness, yes. I was
2	thinking of Fox in those terms. The context was size
3	of audience, and for their programming they have a
4	fairly good-sized audience, not as big as the three
5	majors. So, yes, I would think that a cable operator
6	would want to include them.
7	Q One of the things that I thought was
8	driving your testimony here about cable operators
9	wanting a distant public television signal when they
10	didn't have a local was that there was some
11	programming that you consider very valuable
12	programming that's out there that they just didn't
13	have locally, right?
14	A That's right.
15	Q Wouldn't those same considerations apply
16	if you had a community where there was no local Fox
17	signal and as a result you couldn't get, for example,
18	the NFL telecast or the Major League Baseball telecast
19	or the NHL telecast on Fox?
20	A Well, that would certainly be programming
21	that many people are interested in that would not be
22	available locally if they did not bring it in. I

1	would agree with that.
2	Q And in that case, having brought in a
3	distant Fox signal where there is no local Fox signal
4	
5	A Right.
6	Q would be valuable to the operator.
7	A Yes.
8	Q In much the same way that bringing in the
9	distant public television station would be valuable.
10	A Yes. Although we have a more complete
11	schedule that we provide to a cable operator. There's
12	more than what Fox provides, I believe
13	Q Sure.
14	A including the children's service,
15	including the big variety of programming we have. Fox
16	tends to focus on entertainment programming, and ours
17	is a variety of things.
18	Q And we talked earlier about how there are
19	about 255 cable systems that imported a distant public
20	television station where there was no local public
21	television station, correct?
22	A Yes.

1	Q And those 255 cable systems had a total of
2	about \$3.7 million in royalties according to JSC 25-X.
3	Do you accept that number?
4	A Let me find it again before I agree with
5	that. Sorry, I'm losing track
6	MR. HESTER: Let me object to the question
7	in so far as Mr. Garrett's representing a statement of
8	fact that I don't think has been put into evidence.
9	MR. GARRETT: Well, I thought I was doing
10	what's been done throughout the proceeding here. We
11	have an exhibit here I think will support that number.
12	I was making representation based on that number,
13	again subject to my check.
14	JUDGE von KANN: I'm assuming
15	hypothetically that the calculations come out this
16	way.
17	MR. GARRETT: Sure.
18	JUDGE von KANN: All right. Overruled.
19	MR. GARRETT:
20	Q Assume that there were 255 Form 3 cable
21	systems that have no local public television stations
22	but carried a distant public television station. Will

1	you assume that for me?
2	A Yes.
3	Q And that those 255 cable systems paid
4	about \$3.7 million in royalties for the 1998-2
5	accounting period.
6	A Nineteen ninety-eight-2, is that what you
7	said?
8	Q Yes.
9	A Well, I'll have to take your word for
10	that.
11	Q Again, I think we all should probably do
12	the calculations, but we also have an exhibit that was
13	put in NAB that showed that there are 100 Form 3 cable
14	systems in 98-2 who had no local Fox signal and
15	carried a distant Fox signal, and they paid a total of
16	about \$2.7 million in royalties. Can you accept that
17	for me?
18	A I'll accept it based on this document and
19	that your calculator had a battery in it.
20	MR. GARRETT: Did my calculator have a
21	battery in it?
22	PARTICIPANT: Indeed.

1	JUDGE von KANN: And you punched the right
2	buttons.
3	MR. GARRETT:
4	Q But you see some similarities, would you
5	not, between those two groups of cable systems?
6	A Yes. Yes. Sounds like the Fox stations
7	were carried on larger systems.
8	Q Right. But in both cases, the cable
9	systems were importing something
10	A Right.
11	Q that was not there available in the
12	community, correct?
13	A Yes. Yes.
14	Q I wanted to ask you received some
15	questions from the Panel earlier about the program
16	duplication study that you did for '98 to '99.
17	A Yes.
18	Q And, again, I think you when you chose
19	the particular systems you were not making any
20	scientific random sample, were you?
21	A That's correct. I was just trying to get
22	a geographic spread and just handpicked them out of a

1	list.
2	Q All right. So you're not, as a
3	professional researcher, projecting the results of
4	this particular research here to the entire universe
5	of cable systems, are you?
6	A No. The reason we included it at all is
7	because it pointed in the same direction as the
8	earlier, more rigorous studies.
9	Q Okay. And in your view, the examination
10	that you conducted here of those cable systems for the
11	'98 to '99 period led you to believe that there is no
12	significant change in the amount of duplication of
13	public television programming from the earlier
14	periods.
15	A That's correct.
16	Q Okay.
17	A Very similar pattern.
18	Q All right. Let me have marked as JSC
19	Exhibit Number 26 a series of pages that we received
20	from Public Television in discovery.
21	(Whereupon, the above-referred
22	to document was marked as

1	JSC Exhibit No. 26-X for
2	identification.)
3	Q Mr. Fuller, have you had an opportunity to
4	take a look at what's been marked as JSC Exhibit
5	Number 26-X?
6	A Okay. Yes, I have.
7	Q That document look familiar to you?
8	A It looks like our data. I'm not sure who
9	typed it up, and I don't recognize the handwriting on
10	it.
11	Q That's not your handwriting?
12	A Oh. No, it's not. But it looks like our
13	data. I mean we set it up this way.
14	Q Right. And for the record, this bears the
15	Bate stamp numbers PTV000396 on the first page, 397 on
16	the second page, 454 on the third page and 477 on the
17	fourth page. Were these the particular cable systems
18	that you had studied as part of this '98-'99
19	duplication analysis?
20	A Yes, I believe they are.
21	Q Okay. On the first page, there is no
22	indication of which cable systems these signals were

1	carried on. Do you know which ones they were carried
2	on?
3	A No, I don't. I mean that puzzles me. I
4	don't know why it's not on here.
5	Q Okay. And on the second page, we do see
6	the cable systems in Ashford, Connecticut, Milford,
7	Pennsylvania.
8	A Right.
9	Q Rensselaer, Indiana.
10	A I have a clean exhibit. I mean why are we
11	looking at this stuff? Well, go ahead, I'm sorry.
12	It's your questioning.
13	Q All right. Can you just tell me whether
14	all of these particular cable systems were the ones
15	that were included within your study?
16	A This is the one I was referring to under
17	18 of my exhibits. I'll have to check. The last page
18	is a little hard to follow because someone has
19	handwritten different names from what I have in my
20	exhibit. I'm not quite sure why, but I think these
21	are the same pairs of stations being compared in spite
22	of what the name of the city may be.

1	Q All right. But looking at Exhibit 18,
2	does it help you determine what communities are
3	represented by that first page here?
4	A Yes, it does.
5	Q Okay.
6	A It's all in one place.
7	Q Which communities are represented here,
8	Mr. Fuller?
9	A Oh, I see. Yes, I see. I'm sorry, what
10	was your question, Mr. Garrett?
11	Q Which communities are represented here on
12	the first page of 26-X?
13	A Let me see. It's going to take a little
14	while. This is the one that's unlabeled. All right.
15	The first line is a cable system in Ashford,
16	Connecticut. The second one is also Ashford. Let me
17	just jot that down. Okay. The next pair, WNET the
18	next pair involving WNET is Milford, Pennsylvania, and
19	the next pair involving WYIN is Rensselaer, Indiana.
20	And then we have this next group in Ohio and
21	Pennsylvania, just a moment. The three for WOUC are
22	Stubenville, Ohio, and the three for WQED, a

1	Pittsburgh station. Wait, I've got one more here than
2	is in my exhibit. There must have been something
3	there's one missing. I've got NEO and NPB. We must
4	have removed the one for WQEX. That also is
5	Stubenville. So all of those in that last group are
6	Stubenville.
7	Q All right. Let me hand you a document
8	I've marked as JSC Exhibit Number 27-X.
9	(Whereupon, the above-referred
10	to document was marked as
11	JSC Exhibit No. 27-X for
12	identification.)
13	Q And while we're at it, I'll give you 28-X.
14	(Whereupon, the above-referred
15	to document was marked as
16	JSC Exhibit No. 28-X for
17	identification.)
18	A All right.
19	PARTICIPANT: Is 27 and 28 the same?
20	MR. GARRETT: Twenty-seven should be
21	they're both from Hagerstown. One is for 28 is
22	WWPB and 27 is WETA.

1	PARTICIPANT: I have the exact same
2	document for WWPB.
3	JUDGE von KANN: You have what?
4	PARTICIPANT: I think it might have been
5	just a mistake for me.
6	MR. GARRETT: Okay. You don't have
7	PARTICIPANT: I don't have WETA.
8	MR. GARRETT: He needs 27. First let me
9	move 26-X for substantive purposes.
10	MR. HESTER: I don't have an objection to
11	that.
12	JUDGE von KANN: All right. So received.
13	(Whereupon, the above-referred
14	to document, previously marked
15	as JSC Exhibit No. 26-X for
16	identification, was admitted
17	into evidence.)
18	BY MR. GARRETT:
19	Q And 27-X, Mr. Fuller, can you identify
20	that for us?
21	A This is a list of the programs carried on
22	WETA for the period February 15 through 21 of 1999.

1	Q All right. And WETA was one of the
2	stations that you studied in your duplication
3	analysis, correct?
4	A That's right.
5	Q And you studied in the cable system in
6	Hagerstown.
7	A That's right.
8	Q And that's shown on Exhibit 18, your
9	Exhibit 18 and also on 26-X, correct?
10	A Correct.
11	Q All right. And 28-X, can you describe
12	that?
13	A Twenty-eight-X, this is the program
14	schedule for WWPB for that same period in February of
15	1999.
16	Q Okay. And WWPB and WETA were both carried
17	by the Hagerstown cable system.
18	A That's correct.
19	Q Incidentally, you list in 26-X, there's
20	indications in other places that particular signals
21	are either L or D; do you see that?
22	A In 26-X?

1	Q Yes. That was the
2	A Yes, I see that.
3	Q Okay. And I don't know what you said
4	this was not your handwriting, so I don't know if you
5	know the answer, but a number of these signals that
6	were studied were actually partially distant signals
7	on the cable systems, were they not?
8	A That's my understanding, yes.
9	Q Okay. So even though they might be listed
10	here as a D signal, you've been using the designation
11	X for partially distant, correct?
12	A Right.
13	Q And several of these are in fact partially
14	distant signals, correct?
15	A That may be, yes.
16	Q All right. Let me just turn your
17	attention then to the program schedules here. And did
18	you mark these particular schedules here as part of
19	your analysis? Those Xs that we see, are those your
20	Xs?
21	A I was trying to remember because those
22	are not my Xs and I'm trying to remember I thought

1	I had done these myself. Because what I did was
2	no, maybe I had some help. It was last fall and I
3	can't remember exactly what happened.
4	Q All right.
5	A But I just simply ran my finger down the
6	two columns of the two TV station schedules and looked
7	for matches, and then I would put an X.
8	Q Right. That's what I wanted to get into
9	briefly exactly how you did the analysis here. When
10	you say you looked for matches, you looked for matches
11	at the same time the exact same half-hour or hour,
12	correct?
12	correct? A Right.
13	A Right.
13 14	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which
13 14 15	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which is WETA, I see an X at 9 a.m. on Monday for
13 14 15 16	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which is WETA, I see an X at 9 a.m. on Monday for Teletubbies; do you see that?
13 14 15 16 17	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which is WETA, I see an X at 9 a.m. on Monday for Teletubbies; do you see that? A Yes, I do.
13 14 15 16 17	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which is WETA, I see an X at 9 a.m. on Monday for Teletubbies; do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And if I go to 9 a.m. on WWPB, which is
13 14 15 16 17 18	A Right. Q So, for example, if we look at 27-X, which is WETA, I see an X at 9 a.m. on Monday for Teletubbies; do you see that? A Yes, I do. Q And if I go to 9 a.m. on WWPB, which is 28-X, I see Teletubbies there as well?

1	one duplication, correct?
2	A That's correct.
3	Q On the first day I would see that there
4	are four programs that ran at exactly the same time,
5	correct?
6	A That's right.
7	Q And down on the left hand side there,
8	beneath that first column, there's the number 32; do
9	you see that?
10	A Yes, I see the 32.
11	Q Right. This is on Exhibit 27 here. That
12	reflects the total number of programs that were
13	broadcast by WETA on that particular Monday, correct?
14	A That's right.
15	Q So your analysis was four out of 32
16	programs that were duplicated, correct?
17	A Yes.
18	Q And I guess you would in fairness here,
19	you would count it as a duplication even though they
20	might be different episodes, correct?
21	A That's right.
22	Q So, for example, the Teletubbies 136 might

1	be a different Teletubbles than the probably was
2	than Teletubbies 106.
3	A Well, that says right there it is
4	different.
5	Q Okay. If I wanted to just determine how
6	many of the programs on that one day were programs
7	that were carried by both stations, I could do that,
8	could I not, by looking at this exhibit?
9	A Yes, you could.
10	Q And so, for example, I go to WETA Monday
11	at 6 a.m., I see Arthur.
12	A Yes.
13	Q Arthur is also broadcast by or was
14	broadcast by WWPB on that particular day, correct?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And Sesame Street was broadcast by WETA
17	and WWPB, correct?
18	A Right, at different times.
19	Q All right. And then we see Arthur again
20	at 8 a.m., so that was also broadcast by both
21	stations, correct?
22	A Yes, it was.

1	Q And Barney and Friends also was broadcast
2	by both stations, albeit at different times, correct?
3	A Just a moment. Yes. Yes. I found Barney
4	on WWPB. Yes, at quite different times.
5	Q Okay. And then we see our Teletubbies.
6	Going down a little further, again we see another
7	Sesame Street, correct?
8	A The 3821 episode?
9	Q Right.
10	A Yes, I see that.
11	Q And that was broadcast by both WETA and
12	WWPB.
13	A Yes, they were.
14	Q In fact, there was a case where it was
15	exactly the same episode, just a half-hour apart,
16	correct?
17	A That's right.
18	Q And then if I go down, Mr. Rogers'
19	Neighborhood was also broadcast by both WETA and WWPB?
20	A Yes.
21	Q All right. And going further, again we
22	have Teletubbies. That was commonly carried by both

1	stations, correct?
2	A Yes, they both carried it.
3	Q All right. And if I just keep going down
4	I would see that if I was just simply looking at the
5	series or the programs that were carried on both
6	stations, that we would come up with a number of about
7	18 that were common to both stations.
8	A That were carried the same day.
9	Q Right. But they might be carried at
10	slightly different times, right?
11	A Yes.
L2	Q And they might be different episodes,
L3	right?
L4	A Yes.
L5	Q Right. But they would still be the same
L6	series, correct?
L7	A Right.
L8	Q So if we did that analysis, we would come
L9	up with a number of 18 out of over 32 as duplications
20	as opposed to four over 32 as duplications.
21	A Same day duplication.
22	Q Right. Now, a number of these programs

1	here on WETA that were broadcast on Monday were also
2	broadcast at least later during that week, were they
3	not?
4	A Well, I don't know. They may have been.
5	Q Well, for example, Sesame Street on Monday
6	at 10:30 a.m.; do you see that?
7	A Yes.
8	Q That was also broadcast on Saturday at
9	6:30 p.m. on WETA.
10	A Are you referring to the exact same
11	episode or just the fact that they had Sesame later in
12	the week?
13	Q Well, I think in this particular case, I
14	was referring to the exact same episode.
15	A So you're saying it's on Saturday. Let me
16	just take a quick look. Yes, they did, they repeated
17	it on Saturday morning.
18	Q Right. We could see that particular
19	episode on WETA on Monday and on Saturday. We could
20	also see it on Monday on WWPB, correct?
21	A Yes, that's right.
22	Q And Antiques Road Show, which is on at

1	eight o'clock, we could also see that same episode on
2	Saturday at four o'clock, correct?
3	A Saturday at four? I don't know, I don't
4	think so.
5	Q Well, we'd actually have to go to
6	A Am I looking at the wrong station?
7	Q Well, you have to go to WWPB, and it would
8	be on at two o'clock there.
9	A Oh, well, just a moment. I must be
10	looking at the wrong thing, because at two o'clock on
11	Saturday on WWPB, I see Christina Cooks. The Antiques
12	Road Show was on at 7 p.m.
13	Q Right. And it's the same episode that was
14	broadcast earlier in the week on WWPB and also WETA,
15	correct?
16	A Three-oh-five. Yes.
17	Q All right. Just very simply here, it is
18	not uncommon for a PBS station to broadcast one
19	episode at one part of the week and then rebroadcast
20	it again later in that week, correct?
21	A That's right. They do.
22	Q And they may also broadcast it later in

1	the same day or even the next day, correct?
2	A They might. It depends on children's
3	shows some children's shows they may do that way.
4	Prime-time shows I think they'll tend to schedule in
5	the evening later in the week or maybe on the weekend
6	day-time.
7	Q And there are some other shows here that
8	aren't duplicated. For example, there's Nature
9	Walking with Giants, the Grizzlies of Sieber, which is
10	on WETA at two o'clock. Might that program be
11	broadcast perhaps in a different week on WWPB?
12	A It may have been a prime-time program from
13	the previous week.
14	Q Okay. I just move the admission of 27-X
15	and 28-X.
16	MR. HESTER: For what purpose.
17	MR. GARRETT: Yes, substantive purposes.
18	It was underlying his testimony.
19	MR. HESTER: I don't object.
20	JUDGE von KANN: So received.
21	(Whereupon, the above-referred
22	to documents, previously marked
- 1	1

1	as JSC Exhibit Nos. 27-X and
2	28-X for identification, were
3	admitted into evidence.)
4	BY MR. GARRETT:
5	Q Well, thank you, Mr. Fuller. I have no
6	further questions.
7	A Thank you, Mr. Garrett.
8	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. Music, I guess, is
9	next.
10	MS. WITSCHEL: Pleased to report we have
11	no questions.
12	JUDGE von KANN: No questions. Mr.
13	Satterfield?
14	MR. SATTERFIELD: I have no questions.
15	JUDGE von KANN: No questions. I guess it
16	is then back to you, Mr. Hester. Mr. Stewart?
17	MR. STEWART: I with trepidation would
18	like to ask for some recross.
19	JUDGE von KANN: Well, you certainly have
20	a right. Would you just as soon have that taken now,
21	Mr. Hester?
22	MR. HESTER: Yes, I would, Your Honor, if

1	that's okay.
2	JUDGE von KANN: All right.
3	MR. GARRETT: One final housekeeping
4	business matter. May I have that what's up on the
5	board marked as a demonstration exhibit?
6	JUDGE von KANN: You may. At the next
7	break, you can run it and mark it as a demo.
8	(Whereupon, the above-referred
9	to document was marked as
10	JSC Demo 18 for identification.)
11	MR. HESTER: Judge, one housekeeping
12	matter. We've had Dr. Johnson closeted away today,
13	but I presume he's not going to go on. I just wanted
14	to check. I will have I think maybe 15 minutes or
15	more roughly 15 minutes for Mr. Fuller, maybe 20,
16	but I'm guessing
17	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Stewart, about how
18	long do you think you might be?
19	MR. STEWART: I think 15 minutes.
20	JUDGE von KANN: Okay. Well, it looks
21	like we have a choice here, which is to treat
22	ourselves to actually ending at 5:30 one day like we

1	said at the beginning we were going to but never did,
2	which would not offend the Panel, I don't think
3	necessarily. And that, I guess, would be my
4	preference provided you're pretty comfortable that you
5	can complete Dr. Johnson tomorrow. I guess tomorrow's
6	your last day. Of course, the other alternative is we
7	could get him in here and take his direct and then
8	break for the day. How let's get some estimates on
9	Dr. Johnson perhaps before we make that call. You've
10	been running about an hour or so of direct on each
L1	witness.
12	MR. HESTER: We think that's probably
L3	about right for Dr. Johnson.
L4	JUDGE von KANN: Have we got some
L5	estimates from the big three on the cross of Johnson?
L6	MR. STEWART: We would have very little
L7	for Dr. Johnson.
L8	JUDGE von KANN: Very little.
L9	MR. STEWART: Right.
20	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Garrett?
21	MR. GARRETT: I'll have just enough so
22	that we can leave at 5:30 today.

1	JUDGE von KANN: Okay.
2	(Laughter.)
3	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Tucci?
4	MR. TUCCI: We would be through with Dr.
5	Johnson in time.
6	JUDGE von KANN: You think you can
7	complete tomorrow. And Music and Canadians don't have
8	a whole lot?
9	MR. SATTERFIELD: Small amount.
10	JUDGE von KANN: Small amount. Well,
11	okay. Why don't we complete this Witness and then
12	break for the day. Do you let's see, we've been
13	going here about an hour. Would you just as soon take
14	Mr. Stewart's questions and then have a short break,
15	Mr. Hester?
16	MR. HESTER: That would be all right,
17	sure.
18	JUDGE von KANN: You think you'll be ten
19	or 15 minutes?
20	MR. STEWART: I think so, yes.
21	JUDGE von KANN: Let's go ahead and do
22	that.

1	MR. HESTER: Okay.
2	RECROSS EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. STEWART:
4	Q Mr. Fuller, I want to direct your
5	attention to Program Suppliers Demonstrative Exhibit
6	Number 6, which Mr. Tucci looked at with you, and also
7	your Exhibit Number 11. And in your Exhibit 11, you
8	provided the first couple of pages of Mr. Sieber's
9	testimony, and in Demo 6, Program Suppliers presented
10	the last couple of pages; is that right?
11	A Yes. And I believe, as someone said
12	earlier, this was not part of the report. This was
13	Mr. Sieber's testimony, I believe.
14	Q Okay. And that's what I want to get to.
15	First, to put this in context, in looking at cable
16	networks, such as A&E and Nickelodeon, those cable
17	networks are advertiser-supported and sell national
18	advertising in their channels worth of programming,
19	correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Those cable networks also provide
22	availabilities or spots to allow the cable operator to

1	sell local advertising, correct?
2	A Yes, they do.
3	Q You talked with Mr. Tucci about the
4	overnight ratings that you look at; do you recall
5	that?
6	A Yes, I do.
7	Q Now, the overnight ratings are national
8	ratings, are they not?
9	A No. Not the ones I'm referring to.
10	Q What are they?
11	A They are local market ratings.
12	Q For which local markets?
13	A Nielsen meters has you know what I mean
14	by meters, the measuring device installed in 55
15	markets and that's what we use. We average them to
16	together and use that as a proxy for a national
17	measurement.
18	Q There is a national measurement as well,
19	correct?
20	A There is but PBS is not measured on a
21	daily basis by the national service.
22	Q Okay. And the national service does

1	measure and do you know what it's called?
2	A NTI.
3	Q NTI as opposed to NSI?
4	A NSI is local.
5	Q Okay. The NTI uses national meter sample,
6	correct?
7	A That's right.
8	Q And it's the source, for example, for the
9	commercial television networks, ABC, CBS, NBC, to look
LO	at their ratings on an overnight basis; is that right?
L1	A That's right. On the network level.
L2	Q Okay.
L3	A Yes.
L4	Q Now, are you aware of whether WTBS because
L5	it had national coverage also is reported in the NTI?
L6	A Actually, they are. It's not NTI
7	literally; it's NHI, Nielsen Home Video Index, which
.8	is for cable networks. And they are.
.9	Q But they get national ratings, correct?
20	A They do.
21	Q And WTBS because of that was able to sell
22	national advertising time in the programs on WTBS

1	Superstation, correct?
2	A Yes, I would think so.
3	Q Okay. Now, I'd like to introduce as NAB
4	98-99 Demo 10 the rest of the story.
5	(Whereupon, the above-referred
6	to document was marked as
7	NAB 98-99 Demo 10 for
8	identification.)
9	Q That is, this is the complete direct case
10	testimony of Mr. Sieber, and it's the document from
11	which the first couple of pages of your Exhibit 11,
L2	that's Pages 3 and 4 of this Demo, as well as the
L3	conclusion pages in Program Suppliers Demo 6, were
L4	taken. Do you see that?
L5	A Yes. I was just getting familiar with it.
L6	Just one moment. Sure enough. There is his
L7	conclusion on Page 15.
L8	Q Okay. Now, just also to place this in
L9	context, this was a proceeding like several prior
20	proceedings in which the Program Suppliers and Sports
21	Claimants were actually litigating aggressively, or at
22	least let's say actively; is that right?

1	A I would say that's right.
2	Q It's what we refer to as the old good
3	days.
4	(Laughter.)
5	MR. GARRETT: There was no such thing.
6	MR. STEWART: That may be right in
7	retrospect. But the Sports Claimants were attacking
8	the relevance of viewing measures, and the Program
9	Suppliers were attacking the relevance of the Bortz
10	cable operator survey measures, correct?
11	THE WITNESS: I think that's correct.
12	BY MR. STEWART:
L3	Q Okay. And if you look at this testimony
L4	of Mr. Sieber who is appearing as a witness on behalf
L5	of the Program Suppliers, you can see he talks about
L6	ratings and how they're used? This is the middle part
L7	that was left out of the materials that were presented
L8	to the Panel previously. And if you go back to Page,
L9	let's say, 14, just before the conclusion
20	A All right.
21	Q you see there that Mr. Sieber after
22	this discussion of ratings and various aspects of
	1

1	sports program rights and the like on WTBS presents
2	here some analysis about the relative contributions of
3	sports programs to viewing and add revenue and so on;
4	do you see that?
5	A Yes, I do.
6	Q And at the bottom of the page in a box he
7	talks about how syndicated programs represented 80
8	percent of ad revenue generated by distant signal
9	component of TBS' audience; do you see that?
10	A I do.
11	Q And so that then puts his conclusion pages
12	in better context, is that right, Pages 15 and 16
13	or Page 15 that Mr. Tucci read into the record
14	previously? It makes a bit more sense with those
15	middle pages provided, does it not?
16	A Let me have just a moment to digest this.
17	I believe his point here, because I'm not entirely
18	sure what this table represents, is that the majority
19	of their audience as well as the majority of their
20	revenue by a long shot comes from syndicated
21	programming. So he's placing a very big importance on
22	Nielsen ratings.

1	Q Okay. And WTBS sold advertising time and
2	made revenues through the sale of national advertising
3	in its programs, correct?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Now, going back then to your Exhibit 11,
6	which Mr. Sieber described on Pages 3 and 4 of his
7	testimony, and those are pages you've presented here,
8	as we saw before in the pages taken from the
9	underlying survey, the objective of this survey was
10	for strategic planning purposes for WTBS as a cable
11	network; is that right?
12	A Yes. My understanding was that it was for
13	them to fine tune their program schedule, to adjust
14	the content to match the needs of their subscribers.
15	Q Do you know whether when WTBS converted to
16	a cable network in 1998 it actually reduced the number
17	of baseball games that it carried in 1998?
18	A I'm sorry, I don't know. I really don't
19	know.
20	Q Do you know whether WTBS when it converted
21	to a cable network improved the quality of the
22	syndicated programs that it broadcast as opposed to

1	those that it broadcast while it was a distant signal?
2	A I'd have to guess, I don't know. I don't
3	want to guess.
4	Q Thank you. I have no further questions.
5	JUDGE von KANN: All right. Any other
6	parties other than Mr. Hester have anything? Do you
7	need a full 15, Mr. Hester, or would ten
8	MR. HESTER: Ten would be fine.
9	JUDGE von KANN: Let's take ten minutes,
10	then you can come back and finish.
11	MR. HESTER: Okay. Thank you.
12	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
13	the record at 5:01 p.m. and went back on
14	the record at 5:16 p.m.)
15	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Hester?
16	MR. HESTER: Thank you.
17	All right, Mr. Fuller. I just have a few
18	questions for you.
19	REDIRECT EXAMINATION
20	BY MR. HESTER:
21	Q Let me ask you to turn first back to
22	Program Suppliers exhibit Demo 8. This is the one PBS

1	keeps on site about cable.
2	A I just stacked everything up. Just a
3	minute. Thinking about getting out of here.
4	Q I can't imagine why.
5	A All right. I have it.
6	Q If you look at the third page of that
7	document under the heading "For Can You Say Ancillary
8	Shares, do you remember Mr. Tucci asked you questions
9	about this part of the article?
10	A Yes, I remember.
11	Q And, in particular, it talks about deals
12	relating to toys and books associated with PBS shows?
13	A Yes, I remember.
L4	Q Do you recall that?
L5	A Mr. Tucci had asked you a question as to
L6	whether books featured on Reading Rainbow were part of
L7	these arrangements that are discussed in this article.
L8	Do you recall that?
L9	A Yes.
20	Q Is there any reference in here to Reading
21	Rainbow books being part of the deal that is discussed
22	here?

1	A No.
2	Q What kinds of book deals are being
3	discussed here?
4	A Well, they mention Barney and Teletubbies
5	and then a couple of prime time programs, Lewis and
6	Clark and Stephen Hawking's Universe.
7	Q So those would be books related to a
8	program developed or paid for in part by Public
9	Television?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And is one example some of the
12	merchandising money that has been generated by Barney
13	after Public Television developed that into a major
14	brand?
15	A That's right.
16	Q Could you just explain a little bit more
17	about what happened in relation to Barney after Public
18	Television had developed it into a major figure or
19	icon?
20	A Well, it became a very valuable property.
21	I mean, the videos have been a good seller because of
22	its awareness and its popularity and the fact that the
1	

1	children love it. So there have been I know there
2	have been a number of plush toys made and sold.
3	I don't know the figures, but I know
4	because of its popularity, it was able to sell
5	merchandise. And I believe it has been quite
6	successful at that.
7	Q Did PBS share in some of that?
8	A A small part of it, as I recall.
9	Q Was that part of what was trying to be
10	changed in this time frame to give PBS a fair share of
11	that sort of revenue?
12	A That's what I recall from that time.
13	Q Let me ask you, over on the next column of
14	that same section, right above the photograph of Mr.
15	Duggan with Ken Burns, there is a sentence in the
16	right column, "We return almost all of that to good
17	programming." Do you see that?
18	A Yes, I do.
19	Q Do you agree with that statement?
20	A Of course. I mean, that's what the
21	fund-raising is for, is to support the programming.
22	We are a nonprofit organization.

1	Q So these efforts to develop book deals or
2	extra underwriting funds were to finance more
3	programming for Public Television?
4	A Absolutely.
5	Q Let me ask you to turn back to page 21 of
6	this document. It's the prior page of the exhibit.
7	Over in the right-hand column, Mr. Tucci had asked you
8	about Nickelodeon buying the rights to the entire
9	Children's Television Workshop. Do you see that?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And it refers there to a planned
12	commercial-free educational network called the Noggin.
13	Do you see that?
14	A Yes, I do.
15	Q Was that introduced during this period,
16	the Noggin?
17	A Was that network launched at that time?
18	Q Yes.
19	A I'm sorry, Mr. Hester. I don't recall.
20	It hasn't been a very been in existence for a very
21	long time. And I am not sure it is now.
22	Q Are you aware of whether there is any such

1	thing, even today, in existence?
2	A This is just recall from what I have seen
3	in the trade press. I think it was a partnership of
4	Children's Television Workshop and I guess
5	Nickelodeon. I think that's right. There was some
6	other party.
7	And I believe CTW sold out their portion
8	of it. I think they're now out of it or don't have
9	anything to do with it anymore.
10	Q During the years 1998 and 1999, there was
11	no such educational network called the Noggin, was
12	there?
13	A Well, see, that's what I can't recall in
14	'98-'99 if that was the case.
15	Q Okay.
16	A That's a fact that I don't know.
17	Q By the way, there is a reference in that
18	sentence to a commercial-free educational network. Do
19	you see that?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Mr. Tucci had asked you some questions
22	about the lack of commercials on Public Television and

1	had you whether that simply related to the format of
2	the programming. Do you recall that?
3	A Yes.
4	Q You discuss in your testimony why the lack
5	of commercials on Public Television would have value
6	to a cable operator. Do you recall that testimony?
7	A Yes, I do.
8	Q Could you explain that, please?
9	A Well, the value to the cable operator is
10	certainly to satisfy the needs of the subscribers, who
11	have said in various surveys, including one we
12	submitted as evidence, that they value a noncommercial
13	environment, especially for children. Is that an
14	answer?
15	Q I just wanted you to expand a little bit
16	on whether you accepted Mr. Tucci's comment that that
17	is simply an element of the format of the programming
18	that doesn't bear on its value.
19	A I don't accept that because it does bear
20	on the value. I think it makes Public Television a
21	more attractive channel to offer on a cable system.
22	Q Mr. Tucci had put up an example on the

board, Mr. Fuller. It's since been lost to Mr.
Garrett. He had an example up on the board of a
comparison between Nickelodeon and how much it might
cost a cable system with 30,000 subscribers versus a
cost he imputed for carrying a distant Public
Television signal. Do you recall that?
A Yes, I do.
Q Now, in relation to the amount that might
be paid for Nickelodeon, are there advertising slots
provided by Nickelodeon to the local cable operator?
A Yes, there are.
Q So would those advertising availabilities
be an offset against the license fee paid for
something like Nickelodeon?
A Absolutely. It's another source of
revenue and would offset it.
Q And is that different from what would be
relevant with respect to a distant signal?
A That's right because there would not be
any availabilities in the distant signal for them to
insert local commercials and make revenue off of it.
Q So would you expect, in fact, to see

1	higher license fees paid for a cable network where
2	there were advertising availabilities made or given to
3	the local cable operator?
4	A Most definitely.
5	JUDGE GULIN: I am sorry. As compared to
6	what?
7	BY MR. HESTER:
8	Q As compared to a cable network where there
9	were no advertising availabilities provided?
10	A Yes.
11	JUDGE GULIN: I guess that assumes that
12	everyone has exactly the same programming. Obviously
13	HBO doesn't have advertising. That's a lot more
14	expensive than the cable networks that have
15	advertising, right, all else being equal, I guess?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, right. That is a good
17	way of putting it.
18	BY MR. HESTER:
19	Q Mr. Tucci also derived an amount that
20	might be paid for that hypothetical cable system with
21	respect to Public Television as a distant signal. Do
22	you recall that?

1	A Yes.
2	Q To your understanding, what does the cable
3	operator have to pay in order to gain access to a
4	Public Television distant signal? Does it have to pay
5	a market price?
6	A No.
7	Q What does it pay?
8	A I don't believe it pays anything.
9	Q Does it pay a compulsory license fee?
10	A Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, of course, it does.
11	There is that
12	JUDGE von KANN: That which brings us
13	here.
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, of course. What am I
15	saying.
16	MR. HESTER: We are gathered here today.
17	THE WITNESS: I am losing brain power
18	fast.
19	BY MR. HESTER:
20	Q Could there be in your mind, Mr. Fuller,
21	a difference between what the cable operator has to
22	pay to obtain access to a distant signal and the value

1	it would place on it?
2	A I'm sorry. Ask that again.
3	Q Could there be a difference between the
4	amount that a cable operator has to pay as a
5	compulsory license to obtain a distant signal versus
6	the value it would place on that distant signal in
7	terms of the programming it offers?
8 .	A I believe so, yes.
9	Q Can you explain that, please?
10	A Yes because I don't think in every case
11	that the amount of money paid translates into value to
12	the cable operators. I mean, look at the example of
13	Nickelodeon, for example. They get avails and for
14	local sales, in addition to the program service
15	itself.
16	And in the case of PBS, there are all of
17	the advantages that we discussed earlier that the
18	cable operator gets for the benefit of attracting
19	subscribers and retaining subscribers.
20	Q Mr. Tucci had put up the example of
21	Nickelodeon. I now wanted to ask you to turn to
22	another exhibit, Program Suppliers exhibit 34-X,
1	1

1	please. I can show this to you quickly, Mr. Fuller.
2	A Oh, okay. Okay.
3	Q Let me show you Program Suppliers 34-X and
4	then Program Suppliers Demo 9. Do you recall Program
5	Suppliers Demo 9? This showed average ratings.
6	A Yes, I do.
7	Q For different cable networks. And then it
8	showed an average rating for PBS?
9	A Yes.
LO	Q So, for instance, for PBS, he showed a
L1	decline of ten percent from '97-'98 to '98-'99 because
.2	of the drop in the ratings from 1.0 to 0.9, right?
.3	A That's right.
_4	Q Now, first of all, let me ask you to
.5	explain again. Are these ratings between PBS and
.6	these other services directly comparable?
.7	A They are directly comparable. They are
.8	all total U.S. as the basis.
.9	Q You had made a point before about the
20	difference between a 24-hour day on some of these
1	examples versus PBS.
2	A Oh, that. All right. And in that

1	respect, no, they're not, because PBS is on the air
2	less than 24 hours.
3	Q One of the ones that was omitted from Mr.
4	Tucci's Demo 9 was Nickelodeon. I simply wanted to
5	show you on Program Suppliers exhibit 34-X. If you
6	could look at the ratings for Nickelodeon between
7	'97-'98 and '98-'99, what do they show?
8	A They show that it went down from a 1.2 to
9	a 1.1, which is a decline of 8 percent.
10	Q So if Nickelodeon had been included on
11	Program Suppliers Demo 9, that would have shown a
12	decline comparable to the one shown for PBS?
13	A That's right.
14	JUDGE YOUNG: I am sorry. What page on
15	34-X are you looking at?
16	MR. HESTER: I am sorry, Your Honor. It's
17	914 working off of the bates stamp.
18	JUDGE YOUNG: Okay.
19	MR. HESTER: I think that's the right
20	number for the sources.
21	BY MR. HESTER:
22	Q Mr. Fuller, you had made a point that

1	ratings during this period for start-up cable networks
2	would be affected by their increase in penetration.
3	A I did say that.
4	Q Could you explain what you mean by that?
5	A Well, that's when the ratings are
6	calculated on the total U.S. population as the
7	denominator. So if a cable network starts out in the
8	very beginning with a small number of subscribers,
9	then, of course, it's whatever the number of actual
10	viewers are within that little subscriber universe
11	when divided by the total United States population.
12	You're going to have a very small or even a
13	non-reportable, below minimum rating situation with
14	Nielsen.
15	Q So let me just take a concrete example.
16	If you had a cable network that was on a certain
17	number of systems, let's say it's X number of systems
18	and the cable network has a two rating measured on
19	this U.S. basis. Okay? Are you with me so far?
20	A Uh-huh.
21	Q And if the cable system in the next period
22	is carried on 2-X number of systems

1	A You've doubled the number of systems.
2	Q You've doubled the number of systems, but
3	the viewing within any particular system remains the
4	same.
5	A Right.
6	Q What happens to the total rating?
7	A It doubles.
8	Q And so the rating could double simply
9	because you have added more subscribers who have the
10	opportunity to watch. It doesn't necessarily tell you
11	that the level of viewing on any particular system has
12	changed, does it?
13	A Not on any particular system, no, it does
14	not, because you're adding more and more systems and
15	more and more subscribers. And that is enlarging the
16	probability that a person will watch within the total
17	United States population.
18	JUDGE YOUNG: That goes to the picture we
19	were referring to yesterday between ratings and share.
20	Is that what you're saying?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	JUDGE YOUNG: Rating as availability,

1	share is actual viewing?
2	THE WITNESS: Well, it is a similar
3	concept. That's the share is among households
4	where the set is turned on to something, in use. So
5	that is the viewing population. And then you compute
6	a share of those, even though it may be small, like
7	Sunday morning.
8	This is and so it's a similar idea
9	mathematically where you've got a small number of
10	people who could see it at all in the case of a
11	start-up network.
12	JUDGE YOUNG: We should be careful, then,
13	when looking at PS 34-X that that is referring to
14	rating, as different from shares?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes. There's no shares in
16	34-X. We don't usually use shares.
17	So, to summarize, growth can be growth
18	with a rating in a new cable network can be entirely
19	as a result of increasing penetration, a greater
20	number of subscribers without any increase in the
21	rating within each cable system.
22	MR. HESTER: Okay.

MR. HESTER: Okay.

1.	BY MR. HESTER:
2	Q I wanted to ask you about some questions
3	Mr. Garrett raised with you concerning the percentage
4	of households with children under 12. Do you recall
5	that discussion?
6	A Yes, I do.
7	Q And if I can find it here, I wanted to
8	refer back first to your testimony from the 1990 to
9	'92 case. Do you have that there, Mr. Fuller?
10	A I'm trying to find it. Just a moment.
11	Yeah, I have it, Demo 16.
12	Q If you do, you're ahead of me.
13	A Do you want mine?
14	Q No. Okay. Mr. Fuller, let me ask you to
15	turn to the page in that testimony where you gave this
16	figure on the percentage of households with children
17	under 12. I think
18	A It's going to take a moment. It's deep in
19	the report. It's on page 2.
20	Q What I needed to do was to find the later
21	source for that. I'm sorry. Yes. It's page 14. Are
22	you in JSC Demo 16, Mr. Fuller?

1	A I am.	
2	Q And do you see page 14?	
3	A I'm there.	
4	Q This is where you make the statement in	
5	your prior testimony, "Over one-third of all	
6	households in the United States have children under	
7	the age of 12. Nearly one in six have children under	
8	six"? Do you see that?	
9	A Yes, I see that.	
10	Q What is the source given there?	
11	A It's the Bureau of the Census. It's one	
12	of their public population publications.	
13	Q Now I wanted you to turn to the place in	
14	your current testimony where you give a comparable	
15	number, which is going to be page 9. This is where	
16	you say, "Twenty-eight percent of all households in	
17	the United States had children under the age of 12."	
18	A Yes, I see that.	
19	Q What is your source there?	
20	A That source is Nielsen.	
21	Q So these two numbers were sourced from	
22	different places?	

Τ	A They were.
2	Q Is that right? Let me ask you. I'm sorry
3	I don't have copies of this. Oh, you do have copies
4	of it?
5	MR. HESTER: Your Honor, maybe I should
6	just ask for a piece of clarification on this. This
7	is the source material that underlay the witness'
8	citation in the 1990 to '92 case on this point. It's
9	now become an issue that we need to clarify. I guess
10	that this should be presented as an exhibit of some
11	sort.
12	JUDGE von KANN: This is from the Bureau
13	of the Census report?
14	MR. HESTER: Yes. It's from the Bureau of
15	Census.
16	JUDGE von KANN: We could probably take
17	public notice.
18	MR. HESTER: You can probably take notice
19	of it.
20	JUDGE von KANN: Is anybody going to have
21	objection to receiving the Bureau of Census pages on
22	which this earlier testimony is based?
1	ł

1	(No response.)
2	JUDGE von KANN: It doesn't sound like it.
3	MR. HESTER: Okay.
4	JUDGE von KANN: So why don't you mark it
5	as your next exhibit number, whatever it would be.
6	MR. HESTER: Twenty-seven. So this would
7	be PTV exhibit 27.
8	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
9	document was marked for
10	identification as PTV Exhibit
11	Number 27.)
12	BY MR. HESTER:
13	Q Mr. Fuller, pointing you to PTV exhibit
14	27, is this the source that you relied on in your 1990
15	to '92 testimony in providing the statement about the
16	percentage of households with children under the age
17	of 12?
18	A Yes, it is.
19	Q I wanted to direct you to the second page
20	of the document, please. There is a number there for
21	total households if you look up at the top of the page

1	A That's right.
2	Q And then it shows underneath it with
3	members of either sex first under 6 years and then,
4	second, 6 to 11 years?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And is that the source material that went
7	into the figure that you gave there of one-third of
8	all households having children under the age of 12 or
9	over one-third?
10	A Yes, it is.
11	Q Could you explain whether there is some
12	error or anomaly in those data?
13	MR. GARRETT: I think I am going to
14	object. Is the purpose of this to impeach the
15	testimony he gave to the arbitration panel back in
16	1992? Is the purpose to show that that testimony that
17	he gave the panel at that time was wrong and the
18	number that was in the record then is no longer to be
19	considered in the record then because he has got a new
20	document that was faxed over to him a few minutes ago?
21	I think this is highly
22	MR. HESTER: Could I be heard on this?

1

JUDGE von KANN: Yes.

2
3 that the denominant of there to the denominant of the denomina

MR. HESTER: I don't believe, in fact, that this number was anything more than a rough benchmark in the prior proceeding. It was just out there to put it in context. But it has now been raised by Mr. Garrett on cross-examination with the implication that there was a decline in the importance of children's programming because there is a lesser proportion of households with children under the age of 12.

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We have used a different source because there was a mistake in the prior source. In the last case, it wasn't an issue. Now it's been made an issue.

I could do it another way, but I thought this was the most appropriate way, to lay out why we used a different source this time. I don't think, in fact, that the issue, the difference should matter to anyone, but it was made an issue in the cross-examination. That is why I am trying to address the point.

MR. GARRETT: First of all, I was simply

22

1	following up the questions of Judge Young. He had
2	asked the question of the witness. The witness
3	couldn't remember what he had testified to the last
4	time. I simply brought up what was testified to
5	before the arbitration panel.
6	To say that that wasn't at all significant
7	to the panel, how do we even know that as we speak?
8	That could very well have been something that was
9	important. That was the number that was in the
10	record.
11	They came forward, and they represented to
12	the arbitration panel that the number was over a
13	third. And no one here knows exactly what went on in
14	deliberations or how that might have influenced
15	deliberations in any way.
16	I just don't think it's proper to years
17	after the fact be impeaching the testimony that you
18	gave in that prior proceeding.
19	JUDGE von KANN: Let us speak for a
20	second.
21	(Whereupon, the panel conferred off the
22	record.)

1	JUDGE von KANN: Overruled. We think it
2	goes to weight, and we'll hear. You can ask it.
3	MR. HESTER: Okay.
4	BY MR. HESTER:
5	Q Mr. Fuller, could you explain whether
6	there is some anomaly or error in these figures in
7	relation to the question of the number of households
8	in the U.S. with children under the age of 12?
9	A There was an error made in the way the
10	calculation was done in the '92 data here. There is
11	two groups of children, 17,178.
12	Q Seventeen million?
13	A I'm sorry. Seventeen million if this is
14	minus the three zeros. Yes, numbers in thousands and
15	then the 16,830,000. Whoever prepared this statistic
16	perhaps it was me added the two together and
17	divided by total households, which gave that greater
18	than 33 greater than one-third figure.
19	The problem with that method is that it
20	doesn't remove duplication of children within the same
21	household from the two different age groups. One
22	household could have a four-year-old and a

1	nine-year-old. And in counting both groups and
2	dividing by total households, you then overstate the
3	size of the I don't think I said that right.
4	Well, adding these two together includes
5	children that that counts children twice that are
6	in the same household. So you end up with what seems
7	to be a larger number of households having these
8	children of this age group.
9	What were used this time was Nielsen's
10	data, which is totally unduplicated and tells you the
11	number of children age under 12 that are in TV
L2	households.
L3	Q So the Nielsen data that you relied on at
L4	page 9 in your testimony this time you would consider
L5	more accurate for this purpose?
L6	A Absolutely.
L7	Q Do you know off the top of your head what
L8	the comparable number is for the 1990 to '92 period?
L9	A No, I don't know, but I was surprised when
20	I was shown my previous testimony and saw that there
21	was that much of a gap. I think we figured about six.
22	Was it six points? Because I would expect it to be

1	much lower than that, maybe one or two points.
2	Q When you say you "would expect it to be
3	lower," what do you mean by that?
4	A That the figure in the '90-'92 proceeding
5	would have been closer to the 28 that we're citing now
6	in the '98-'99.
7	JUDGE von KANN: If I am understanding
8	you, this anomaly, if you will, in the Census data was
9	something you discovered after the earlier proceeding
LO	was over and in preparing your testimony here? That's
L1	when it came to your attention?
L2	THE WITNESS: That's exactly right.
L3	BY MR. HESTER:
L4	Q Mr. Fuller, there was some questioning
.5	about exhibit 21 which showed the change in fees paid
.6	for various cable networks as between 1992 and
.7	1998-'99. Do you recall that?
.8	A I think so. I'm a little vague on it.
.9	What was the exhibit again? Maybe I could find it.
20	Q It's exhibit 21. I really wanted to point
21	you to a passage in your testimony.
2	A All right.

1	1 JUDGE GULIN: Of your o	wn testimony,			
2	2 exhibit 21.				
3	THE WITNESS: Oh, okay.				
4	4 MR. HESTER: Yes. It was e	exhibit 21.			
5	THE WITNESS: All right.				
6	BY MR. HESTER:				
7	7 Q What I really wanted to foo	cus you on, in			
8	8 addition to exhibit 21, is the bottom	addition to exhibit 21, is the bottom of page 18 of			
9	9 your testimony.	your testimony.			
10	0 A Did you say page 18?				
11	1 Q Yes.				
12	A All right. I have it.				
13	Q At the bottom of page 18, y	ou talk about			
14	4 the fact that licensees for Nickelodeon	the fact that licensees for Nickelodeon, Discovery, A			
15	and E, and The Learning Channel more that	n doubled from			
16	6 1992 to 1998. Do you see that?				
17	7 A That's on page 18?				
18	Q I think so.				
19	9 A I'm sorry.				
20	Q Fifth line from the bottom.				
21	A I must be going blind. I s	see an average			
22	2 of				

1	Q Second sentence.
2	A From '92 to '98?
3	Q Yes.
4	A I'm sorry. Yes. I see it.
5	Q Okay. Are you with me?
6	A Yes.
7	Q I just wanted you to comment on that
8	point, to explain why you cited that point in relation
9	to discussing the value of Public Television
LO	programming as a distant signal.
L1	A Well, my point in mentioning that was
.2	simply to make the statement of kind of a relativity
.3	statement that these particular channels carried
_4	programming that in some ways is similar to what
.5	Public Television offers.
.6	And their value has more than doubled over
.7	this period of time. And we feel that if cable
.8	operators are willing to pay that, that they must
.9	value Public Television more.
20	Q Could you look at JSC 34-X, please?
1	Actually, I think it's sorry.
2	MR. HESTER: I'm sorry, Your Honor.

1	Program Suppliers 34-X. It's the cable audience
2	report. Sorry. We're all running out of gas here.
3	BY MR. HESTER:
4	Q Mr. Fuller, over on the left-hand column
5	on the first page, Mr. Garrett had asked you a
6	question about "Sports programming continues to drive
7	the largest audiences to cable." Do you see that?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Is that discussing sports programming on
LO	distant signals?
.1	A It's just in general.
.2	Q So that comment includes sports
.3	programming on what kinds of channels?
.4	A Any of the cable channels that offer
L5	sports, like ESPN, which are, of course, widely
.6	available.
.7	Q When you talk about driving audiences to
.8	cable, is that discussing, in particular, sports cable
.9	networks? Is that what
0 :0	A It is, in fact, because the context
1	this is the cable audience report. And that's what
2	that is about.
- 1	

1	Q So it would include as well ESPN regional
2	sports networks?
3	A Yes, sure, although her statement here in
4	this analysis is based on a ranking of the top 100
5	programs. So if a regional network had a large
6	rating, then it would have shown up in the report
7	and shown up in the report, then yes, that would be
8	the case.
9	However, we do not provide it in this
10	report. The ranking that's in appendix 5 excludes, I
11	think it says, sports and I've forgotten what, but
12	this is a ranking of just direct comparison of cable
13	channels, A and E, Discovery mainly, History.
14	Q Okay. Mr. Garrett asked you about the
15	amount of duplication in schedules, and he showed you
L6	a few examples. Do you recall that?
L7	A Yes.
L8	Q I wanted you to discuss, in particular,
L9	some of the points Mr. Garrett raised with you about
20	same-day programming of different kinds of children's
21	programs. Do you recall he asked you questions about
22	children's programs that would be found on the same

1	day
2	A Right.
3	Q on different signals. Do you recall
4	that?
5	A I do remember it.
6	Q Could you discuss whether schedule
7	diversity is particularly beneficial and valuable in
8	relation to children's programming?
9	A I think it is because it makes a good
10	program available at different times of the day when
11	a child can find it. Some are in school. Some are in
12	preschool. Some are in day care centers. And some
13	can see a program in the morning but not in the
14	afternoon. Others can see it in the afternoon but not
15	in the morning. This is I think provides a
16	valuable service to the children and to the family.
17	Q Mr. Garrett had also asked you questions
18	as to whether the cable systems that would place the
19	highest value on a Public Television distant signal
20	would be those that have no local Public Television
21	signal. Do you recall that?
22	A Yes. I do

1	Q Would it always be the case in your view
2	that the highest value would be placed on a Public
3	Television distant signal by a system without a local?
4	A Not in every case because the schedules
5	can be so very different one from another that it's
6	hard to say which is more valuable. If you've got two
7	signals that are very different, they have different
8	content, a lot of different scheduling, then they're
9	both valuable.
LO	Q And could there also be differences in
L1	value for particular cable operators depending on the
L2	nature of their subscriber base?
L3	A Yes, that could be. The subscriber bases
L4	would change, I suppose, depending on the community.
L5	In a different population group, some communities will
L6	have more children than others will have or more or
.7	less education in a given community. And so the cable
-8	operator is going to be selecting channels to bring in
.9	to fit the needs of the community.
20	Q Okay. I just had one more question for
21	you, I think. Mr. Garrett had asked you some
2	questions about the number of Public Television

1	distant signals carried by Form 3 systems in 1992
2	versus '98 and '99. I believe he recited a figure of
3	395 signals carried as distant signals during 1992.
4	MR. GARRETT: I think that is not right.
5	I was referring to the systems.
6	MR. HESTER: You were referring to
7	systems?
8	MR. GARRETT: Yes. And that is all that
9	was shown on that exhibit I handed out.
10	MR. HESTER: You weren't talking about
11	signals? Can you get up here?
12	MR. GARRETT: If you've got another
13	half-hour. But no. I thought I made that clear. The
L4	exhibit only talks about cable systems.
L5	MR. HESTER: Okay. Well, then I don't
L6	need to ask the question.
L7	JUDGE von KANN: Sounds good.
L8	MR. HESTER: I don't need to clean it up
L9	because you just cleaned it. Okay. Thanks. I didn't
20	understand you, Bob. I usually don't.
21	MR. GARRETT: I can't believe that.
22	JUDGE von KANN: Is that it?

1	MR. HESTER: That's all I have. Thank
2	you, Mr. Fuller.
3	JUDGE von KANN: Thank you.
4	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
5	JUDGE von KANN: Does anyone have any
6	recross precipitated by that redirect?
7	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
8	BY MR. GARRETT:
9	Q Mr. Fuller, let me just ask you to turn to
10	
11	JUDGE von KANN: Can I just make one
12	observation that it seems to me that about this point
13	each day, we get into that syndrome, which is not
14	uncommon in these situations, in which the lawyers
15	basically want to argue the cases more than ask
16	questions of the witnesses.
17	In many of these instances, you all are
18	directing us to different pieces of the record, which
19	you will undoubtedly do in your proposed findings, and
20	making arguments about that.
21	I think we all appreciate that is
22	going on. To the extent that we all, including the

7	witness, are pretty tired, I think we should try to
2	keep that to a minimum.
3	You all have got a hefty record to argue
4	from, and there are a lot of arguments that you will
5	be no doubt making. So let's try to make sure, not
6	just today and not just with this witness but in
7	general that we try, particularly when witnesses are
8	really pretty tired, that we truly ask for testimony
9	from them, rather than making argument.
10	Mr. Garrett?
L1	MR. GARRETT: The record is five days for
L2	a witness.
L3	BY MR. GARRETT:
L4	Q Let me just ask you to turn to exhibit
L5	34-X, Mr. Fuller.
L6	A All right.
L 7	Q Again, this is the reference there to
L8	"Sports programming continues to drive the largest
L9	audiences to cable." Do you see that?
20	A Yes, I do.
21	Q You say you were referring or PBS research
22	was referring normally to regional sports networks or

1	ESPN?
2	A We were referring to cable networks,
3	whatever they are, because this is based on the
4	programming we obtained from Nielsen, you know, and
5	it's whatever they're reporting.
6	Q Would you consider WGN to be a cable
7	network?
8	A I'm not sure whether we do or not.
9	Q Well, let me direct your attention to
10	A WGN-C. Is that it?
11	Q Yes.
12	A Then we have
13	Q Look at appendix 1, for example. You
14	include data there for WGN cable. Do you see that?
15	A It's there, yes.
16	Q Okay. So that would be one of the
17	networks that you were referring to?
18	A Yes.
19	MR. GARRETT: I have no further questions.
20	JUDGE von KANN: Mr. Tucci?
21	MR. TUCCI: Just briefly.
22	RECROSS-EXAMINATION

1	BY MR. TUCCI:
2	Q Mr. Fuller, Mr. Hester asked you questions
3	about the availability of the insertion of local
4	commercials on cable network programming. Do you
5	remember that?
6	A I do.
7	Q You have never operated a cable system or
8	worked in one. We established that earlier. Right?
9	A That's right.
10	Q Do you have any idea the amount of revenue
11	that cable systems generate from advertising, either
12	on a specific or a general basis?
13	A Just on a general basis. I know that it's
14	the minority of what they generate. It's probably an
15	important part but shall I go ahead or
16	JUDGE von KANN: Why don't you wait just
17	a second and let there be light. Let's see if it
18	works.
19	(Pause.)
20	THE WITNESS: Okay. Well, let me just
21	shorten the answer that I think most of their revenue
22	comes from subscriber fees.

1	BY MR. TUCCI:
2	Q And if we've received testimony from
3	actual operators, that would be a more reliable
4	indication about these issues? It would be a more
5	reliable source of information than from you, correct?
6	A Well, certainly.
7	Q The infamous PS 34-X, if you could get it
8	out and look at it? I'm going to ask you some
9	questions just to make sure the record is totally
10	clear on the PTV 000914 page.
11	Mr. Hester asked you about the rating for
12	Nickelodeon for the time period 1997 to '98 to 1998 to
L3	'99. And then it went down. Do you see that?
L4	A Yes.
15	Q Do you also see that between 1994 and 1997
L6	it appears to have risen by approximately what, 33
L7	percent?
L8	A That's right.
L9	Q And on the issue of penetration, we can
20	figure out what the penetration of Nickelodeon was for
21	various years in 1994, 1995, et cetera, et cetera, by
22	reference to industry publications like Kagans

1	couldn't we?
2	A Well, it's also in this exhibit.
3	Q PTV page?
4	A It's appendix 1.
5	Q Appendix 1. Great.
6	MR. TUCCI: That's all I have.
7	JUDGE von KANN: Anyone else?
8	(No response.)
9	JUDGE von KANN: All right. Let's break.
10	Mr. Fuller, you're done. Thank you very much.
11	(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)
12	JUDGE von KANN: Let me just confirm that
13	we have Dr. Leland Johnson for tomorrow, and then the
14	musicians start. And I understand that we're starting
15	out with Seth Saltzman and Snuffy Walden. Is that
16	correct? And they're both on for Friday. Is that it?
17	Does your schedule remain the same as you
18	gave it earlier? Okay. Thank you. See you all at
19	9:30.
20	(Whereupon, at 6:01 p.m., the foregoing
21	matter was recessed, to reconvene at 9:30
22	a.m. on Thursday, May 15, 2003.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of: Hearing: Distribution of the

1998 and 1999 Cable Royalty Funds

Before: Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date: May 14, 2003

Place: Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

- All Can